## Catalyzing the contribution of Indigenous Lands to the conservation of Brazil's forest ecosystems

GEF Project ID: 2934 UNDP Project ID: 00071107 - PIMS # 3600 - BRA/09/G32

## **GEF Terminal Evaluation:**

27-Nov-2016 to 19-Dec-2016

**Evaluation Report:** 30-March-2017 (final version)

## **Evaluation Team:**

Guilherme Martins de Macedo Dan Pasca

GEF Focal Areas: Biodiversity GEF-4 Strategic Program: SFM-SO1; BD-SP3

## Implementing Partner and other project partners:

Brazilian Foundation for Indigenous Affairs (FUNAI), Ministry of Environment (MMA) and Indigenous Organizations.

#### Acknowledgements

The evaluators would like to thank all those who contributed their experience, knowledge and views to the preparation of this Terminal Evaluation Report. It is expected that the conclusions and recommendations that emerged from the analysis of data collected during the evaluation will contribute to the improvement of other projects.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Executive Summary	04 10
<b>1</b> 1.1 1.2 1.3	Introduction Purpose of the evaluation Scope & methodology Structure of the evaluation report	. <b>12</b> . 12 . 12 . 13
<b>2</b> 2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6	Project description and development context	. <b>13</b> 13 16 17 .22 . 22
<b>3</b> 3.1 3.2	Findings         Project Design / Formulation         3.1.1 Analysis of LFA / Results Framework         3.1.2 Assumption and Risks         3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects.         3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation         3.1.5 Replication approach.         3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage         3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector         3.1.8 Managements arrangements         Project Implementation.         3.2.1 Adaptive management         3.2.2 Partnership arrangements         3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management         3.2.4 Project Finance         3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation.         3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution, coordination and operational issues	24 24 26 38 .39 .40 41 42 .42 43 45 .46 47 50 53
3.3 3.4	Project Results	56 57 57 71 72 73 74 75 76 79
4	Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons	81

5	Annexes	. 87
5.1	ToR	. 87
5.2	Agenda & Itinerary	103
5.3	Summary of field visits	106
5.4	List of persons interviewed	107
5.5	List of documents reviewed	108
5.6	Evaluation question matrix	108
5.7	Questionnaire used and summary results	108
5.8	UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail	111
5.9	Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form	116

## Executive Summary

#### **Project Summary Table**

Project Title: BRA/09/G32 – Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems						
GEF Project ID:	2934		At endorsement (US\$)	At completion (US\$)		
UNDP Project ID:	3600	GEF Financing:	6,000,000	5,762,185		
Country:	Brazil	IA/EA own:	400,000	400,000		
Region:	Latin America	Government:	26,565,113	17,464,020		
Focal Area:	BD/SFM	Other:	3,777,352	4,684,459		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SFM-SO1; BD-SP3	Total co-financing:	30,742,465	22,548,479		
Executing Agency:	Executing Agency: FUNAI Total Project Cost: 36,742		36,742,465	28,310,664		
Other Partners involved:MMA and Indigenous OrganizationsProDoc Signature: (Operational) Closing Date: Proposed: 30/10/20		30 g Date: : 30/10/2014 Ac	/10/2009 stual: 31/08/2016			

#### **Project Description**

The Project was designed to adopt a ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity. The Project sought to achieve this through the following three Outcomes and their related Outputs:

- 1. Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services,
- 2. A network of ILs modeling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations, and
- 3. Sustainable and replicable models of forest management, based on ethnomanagement principles<sup>1</sup>, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes. Direct global benefits to be delivered include: an increase in the area (4,563,933 ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs located in areas of high priority for biodiversity conservation; maintaining forest habitats in these areas at same or higher levels; improved connectivity between PAs; and improved management effectiveness in the PAs.

This Project represents a joint effort of the Brazilian indigenous organizations, the Brazilian Foundation for Indigenous Affairs (FUNAI), the Ministry of Environment (MMA), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

The project performance is summarized below.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Ethno-management" (ProDoc) or "ethno-environmental management" refers to the broad set of indigenous practices and ways of managing their territories and natural resources based on their traditional ecological knowledge.

#### Rating for project design and outcomes implementation

(according to Rating Table Template on pp. 29-30, UNDP/GEF Guide for Terminal Evaluations, 2012)

CRITERIA (SCALES)	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Monitoring and Evaluation		
M&E Design at Entry (1-6)	3 (MU)	Low initial indicators' quality and lack of revision.
M&E Plan Implementation (1-6)	4 (MS)	Despite of the fragility of the indicators, the M&E Plan was implemented satisfactorily.
Overall quality of M&E (1-6)	3 (MU)	
2. IA& EA Execution		
Quality of UNDP Implementation (1-6)	5 (S)	Good coordination with FUNAI. Flexibility in implementation, adapted execution tools.
Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (1-6)	5 (S)	Good coordination with UNDP, MMA, ICMBio, NGOs and Indigenous Organizations; Adaptive Management; Efficient and Engaged PMU.
Overall quality of Implementation/ Execution (1-6)	5 (S)	
3. Assessment of Outcomes		
Relevance (1-2)	2 (R)	Constitution (Art. 231 & 232), PNB, PNAP, PNGATI
Effectiveness (1-6)	5 (S)	PNGATI and management tools tested.
Efficiency (1-6)	5 (S)	Compared with other protection strategies minor costs. FUNAI careful with the use of money.
4. Sustainability		
Financial resources (1-4)	3 (ML)	Amazon Fund, Climate Fund, GEF, but low State capacity.
Socio-political (1-4)	3 (ML)	Mobilized IPs and partners, but political drawbacks.
Institutional framework and governance (1-4)	4 (L)	PNGATI and its Steering Committee; Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI (budget 2016-2019).
Environmental (1-4)	4 (L)	Mobilized IPs and partner network.
Overall likelihood of sustainability (1-4)	3 (ML)	
4. Impact		
Environmental Status Improvement (1-3)	2 (M)	By enhancing the protection and sustainable use of indigenous lands.
Environmental Stress Reduction (1-3)	3 (S)	Reduced vulnerability of indigenous lands to external and internal threats.
Progress towards stress/status change (1-3)	3 (S)	IPs and communities trained, PNGATI adopted and its instruments and tools tested.
Overall Project Result (1-6)	<b>5</b> (S)	Satisfactory

**Rating scales used**: (S) - Satisfactory; (MS) - Moderately Satisfactory; (MU) - Moderately Unsatisfactory; (L) - Likely; (ML) - Moderately Likely; (R) - Relevant.

#### Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

#### Conclusions

This evaluation found that the Project achieved its expected outcomes and was conducted satisfactorily during its period of activity. Briefly, one can say that:

- The Project achieved its immediate objective to consolidate and test an environmental and territorial management strategy for indigenous lands with active participation of indigenous peoples which, effectively, is an instrument for the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity. This strategy was effective both broadly, through the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI), and locally, through the set of actions for the management and planning of conservation and sustainable use of reference areas.
- 2. The Project worked effectively towards the sustainability of its outcomes contributing decisively through funding and technical support to the process of drafting the PNGATI. The PNGATI is currently the reference for action by the Brazilian government on the subject, and it sets the framework for the planning of all actions related to the topic.
- 3. The Project fully achieved the first expected outcome, namely the development of instruments for the recognition of indigenous lands as areas of effective conservation and protection (through sustainable use) of biological diversity. These instruments were: improving the participatory process of preparing PGTAs, including the impact of their discussion process among indigenous people, with regard to the protection of their territory and their environment; processes related to Territorial and Environmental Management Plans (PGTAs Planos de Gestão Territorial e Ambiental) such as ethnomapping and development and testing of mapping resources.
- 4. The Project used different sources of funding for its activities, such as external funds (Amazon Fund and Climate Fund), and identified and utilized a number of partnerships for its implementation (NGOs, local indigenous organizations, universities, regional and national indigenous organizations, other ministries and public agencies.
- 5. The financial sustainability of PNGATI, one of the outcomes of the Project, is facilitated by its inclusion in FUNAI's Multi-Year Plan and by the organization of the government's efforts on the theme through the Comprehensive Plan for the Implementation of the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands.
- 6. The second expected outcome is considered accomplished by the Project by means of the various pieces of evidence of network action involving reference areas (at the local level) and wider levels (regional). The Project set up these networks through the exchange of experiences and courses bringing together representatives of different indigenous lands. The networks were not limited to indigenous communities, as they also included (through training courses and thematic meetings) civil servants involved in the subject from various ministries, representatives of the indigenous movement, and civil society partners.
- 7. The Project has reached its third outcome by testing and consolidating models for forest management and recovery based on ethical principles and according to local indigenous management models and concepts. The evidence is the various forest recovery initiatives based on sustainable use, water sources recovery, and ethno-management of each local arrangement to carry forward these initiatives.

- 8. According to the guidelines for the protection of biodiversity and protected areas of the GEF and the need to achieve the goals of environmental protection and increase the conservation of biological diversity through its sustainable use, <u>the Project is classified as **Relevant**</u>.
- 9. With regards to Efficiency, the cost-effectiveness can be evaluated as positive. The government counterpart was consistent, even if FUNAI only managed to provide half of the initially planned co-financing. Both the UNDP and FUNAI were very careful and responsible with the use of resources and responded with flexibility and adaptive management in delicate moments. The evaluators consider that there was a good coordination with FUNAI and adequate UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team. The focus on results showed flexibility in implementation, searching for adapted execution tools, in order to speed up implementation.
- 10. The most important **Sustainability** factor of the project has been its contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI). The project has supported in various ways the establishment and continuity of PNGATI's steering committee, composed of representatives of various ministries as well as indigenous representatives. As such, the committee has become one of the principal venues for different ministries to come together and jointly discuss their policies and budgets with regard to indigenous people.
- 11. Positive **Impacts** arise from the better environmental management and protection of indigenous lands, with effects on the self-awareness and the empowerment of indigenous peoples as well as on the well-being of communities. There are clear indications that the project enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and improved ecological status by enhancing the protection and sustainable use of indigenous lands. Thus, Project actions reduced the vulnerability of indigenous lands to external and internal threats, consolidating their contribution as essential areas for conservation of biological and cultural diversity in Brazilian forest biomes.
- 12. The strengths of the Project were:
  - An efficient collaboration between the Project team, the FUNAI and the UNDP CO.
  - An efficient collaboration among the majority of partners, including the NGOs and the governmental agencies.
  - An effective Project ownership by FUNAI and the CGGAM.
  - The flexibility to support the initiatives proposed by the regional coordinators (built with the indigenous people involved),
  - The agility of hiring services from NGOs and other partners provided by the UNDP CO.
  - The engagement and the stability of the project team, including the consultants and the FUNAI staff.
  - The wide disclosure of the results and the knowledge generated by the Project, through publications with partners.

#### 13. The Project weaknesses identified were:

• The growth of the number of the RAs, from 10 to 32. As the project covered more ILs, the operational capacity to plan and perform the activities was hampered.

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

- The inadequate design of some of the Project indicators. There were too many indicators, many of them did not follow the criteria of simplicity, objectivity, and measurability.
- The absence of a monitoring team responsible for identifying weaknesses and reviewing the indicators and the strategies for their follow up.
- The irregular operation of the steering committee which did not work as a decision making and council group.

#### Recommendations

In a forthcoming initiative, there should be a specific check on the quality of the indicators proposed to ensure their feasibility as Project instruments. After the beginning of the Project, there should be an opportunity to correct any problems with the indicators, or replace them, while maintaining their original intent.

It is essential that both institutions, MMA and FUNAI, maintain the momentum towards continuing conservation initiatives in indigenous areas, plans of territorial and environmental management, and environmentally sustainable economic alternatives. Using the experience built with the Project, activities such as recovery of degraded areas, water sources and riparian forests, and sustainable economic alternatives can be replicated in other indigenous areas with adaptations to local contexts.

Thus, the Project should be a model for the environment policies involving conservation, indigenous people and their territories. Therefore we recommend a more intense partnership between FUNAI and the environmental government agencies, in order to ensure not only more support but also the provision of surveys and quantitative data on project impacts,

The National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management in Indigenous Lands should be fully implemented by various ministries and government authorities, also relying on existing international financing funds.

#### Lessons learned

The balance achieved by the Project between its institutionalization and its implementation in part independent of FUNAI should be used right from the start of activities. The implementation of activities through various ways (by regional coordination of FUNAI for micro or small projects, through letters of agreement with partners) proved to be a valuable strategy and largely responsible for the Project's success.

The use of various levels of partnership (national, regional and local) with NGOs, universities, indigenous organizations, and local indigenous associations proved to be an effective way of executing activities. Both the Project's technical capacity and its ability to operate locally were multiplied (using the capacity of partners). It would have otherwise been much more difficult to operate in 32 areas from a base in Brasilia. In the case of local indigenous associations and regional organizations, there was an exchange of benefits: Project activities relied on the experience and activities of indigenous peoples and their organizations were strengthened by the Project.

The GATI project experience demonstrated that **METT** (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) is an inadequate and inappropriate instrument for measuring environmental management effectiveness in indigenous lands. For other GEF indigenous projects related to environment, other instruments should be applied, such as the tool developed by The Nature Conservancy in partnership with the GATI project based on the METT. This tool was applied

in seven of the project's reference areas, and besides showing a greater robustness, had a good acceptance by the communities involved.

As positive practices during Project implementation, one should, first of all, highlight the good coordination achieved between UNDP and FUNAI. Interviews and analysis of the outcomes showed that there was synergy between the institutions and both targeted their activities to ensuring the success of the Project.

The freedom granted to regional coordinators to implement alternatives of action and to plan activities locally in a participatory manner with beneficiaries should also be stressed as a beneficial practice of the Project. This was one of the ways to adapt the Project to various local contexts.

The efficiency and the engagement of the PMU as well as the good liaison between the Project Technical Coordinator and the CGGAM / FUNAI Coordinator during execution should also be viewed as successful practices. The relationship of trust that was established, and especially the shared understanding of the Project challenges and objectives should be emphasized as a basis for successful implementation.

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

AC	Acre State
AM	Amazonas State
AP	Amapá State
APIR	Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil
	Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Northeast Minas Gerais and
	Espirito Santo
	Área(s) Protegida(s)
	America Protected Areas Drogram
	Anazon Region Flotected Aleas Flogian
	Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Southeast
ARPIN-SUL	Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the South
ARPINPAN	Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Pantanal and its Region
BA	Bania State
BRL	Brazilian Real
CAFI	Centre for Indigenous training in the Amazon State
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CE	Ceará State
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CFI(s)	Indigenous people training center(s)
CI	Conservation International
CIR	Indigenous Council of Roraima
COIAB	Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon
COP	Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
ES	Espírito Santo State
FOIRN	Federation of Indigenous Organizations of the Rio Negro
FUNAL	National Foundation for Indigenous Affairs
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GTI	Interministerial Working Group
	Brasilian Institute for the Environment
ICMBio	Brasilian Institute for Biodiversity Conservation
	International Institute for Education in Brazil
IC(s)	Indigenous Crassization(s)
	Indigenous Organization(s)
	Indigenous People
ISPN	Institute for Society, Population and Nature
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDS	Ministry for Social Development
METT	Ferramenta de Monitoramento de Efetividade de Gestao
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MG	Minas Gerais State
MMA	Ministry for Environment
MMJ	Ministry for Justice
MS	Mato Grosso do Sul State
MT	Mato Grosso State
NEX	National Execution
NR	Regional Nucleous
OIT	Organização Internacional do Trabalho
ONGs	Organizações não-governamentais
PAT	Plano Anual de Trabalho
PB	Paraíba State
PDA	Projetos Demonstrativos do Tipo A
PDPI	Projetos Demonstrativos de Povos Indígenas
PE	Pernambuco State

PGTA(s)	Plano(s) de Gestão Territorial e Ambiental – Territorial and Environmental Management Plan(s), referred as "ethno-management plan(s)" at the time of ProDoc
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMU	Project Management Unit
PNAP	National Protected Areas Plan
PNB	Nacional Biodiversity Policy
PNGATI	National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands
POA(s)	Annual Operating Plan(s)
PPTÀĹ	Integrated Project for the Protection of Indigenous Populations and Lands in the Brazilian Amazon
PR	Paraná State
ProDoc	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RJ	Rio de Janeiro State
RA	Reference Areas
RO	Rondônia State
SE	Sergipe State
SNUC	National System of Conservation Units
SO1/GEF	Strategic Objectiv 1 (GEF)
SP	São Paulo State
SP3/GEF	Strategic Priority 3 (GEF)
ILs	Indigenous Lands (Terras Indígenas – TIs)
ТО	Tocantins State
ToR	Terms of Reference
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UC(s)	Conservation Unit(s)
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USD	United States Dollar
WWF	Structuring the National Health System Project World Wildlife Fund

## 1 Introduction

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) was conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF – Financed Projects (2012).

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

#### **1.1** Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this Terminal Evaluation is to analyze the implementation, results and successes of the Project BRA/09/G32, drawing lessons learned that can improve the sustainability of actions proposed by this project and others that may follow it. The evaluation aims to identify the outputs and results of project implementation and the procedures followed to achieve the specific objectives and recommend actions that can improve the design and implementation of other related projects and programs.

#### 1.2 Scope & Methodology

The assessment report of project performance was carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework (Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The report analyzes the five assessment criteria laid out in the document "Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP - Supported, GEF - Financed Projects", which are: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact** and **sustainability**. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (Annex C).

The evaluators followed a participatory and consultative approach, ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, the project team and key stakeholders. The evaluators conducted a field mission to Brasília, as well as the following project sites: Bracuí IL in Rio de Janeiro (nearby Paraty), Cachoeirinha and Lalima ILs in Mato Grosso do Sul (nearby Miranda). Interviews were held with the following organizations and individuals: the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), the National Foundation for Indigenous Affairs (FUNAI), the Ministry of Environment (MMA), the Brazilian Coordination of Indigenous Peoples (APIB), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Institute for Society, Population and Nature (ISPN), the International Institute for Education in Brazil (IEB), Technical and Regional Consultants, and UNDP Country Office.

The evaluators reviewed all relevant sources of information, such as the Project Document, project reports – including Annual PIRs, project budget revisions, Mid-term Review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and project publications. The list of reviewed documents is included in Annex 5.5.

By identifying and analyzing the documentation of the activities of Project BRA/09/G32, the Evaluation will also promote findings and recommendations and suggest ways to improve the implementation of activities related to the scope of the project, providing inputs for new GEF supported projects.

In addition to the above-mentioned purposes, the Terminal Evaluation aims to present to the institutions involved in project implementation all findings and recommendations resulting

from the analysis of documents and procedures, visits to institutions involved in project execution and interviews with thematic experts and those responsible for implementing the BRA/09/G32 Project.

With regard to ethical / confidentiality aspects, the informants are not mentioned by name in this report.

#### **1.3** Structure of the evaluation report

The TE Report structure follows the guidelines proposed by UNDP/GEF, including:

- Executive summary;
- Introduction including an overview of the evaluation process and a brief description of the Project Document, the problems that the project sought to address, the objectives to be achieved, key stakeholders and the expected results;
- Project description and development context;
- Findings regarding the Project Design, Implementation and Results;
- Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

## 2 Project description and development context

#### 2.1 Project start and duration

According to Project Document BRA/09/G32, the project started in October 2009 and the end date was planned to be August 2014. However, after the substantive review, the Project closing date was postponed to October 2016.

#### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The ProDoc identifies the problems that the project sought to address as follows:

"Brazil occupies nearly half the South American continent and covers roughly 8.5 million km<sup>2</sup>. Four of the 6 biomes in Brazil are forests: the world's largest standing tropical rainforests- the Amazonian and Atlantic forests; the Caatinga semi-arid thorn and deciduous forest; and the world's largest savanna-woodlands -the Cerrado. A fifth biome-the inland Pantanal wetlandincludes unique forest ecosystems in the transition between the Amazon and the Cerrado. Not surprisingly Brazil either tops the world list in species diversity for many taxa or is not far behind in others<sup>2</sup>. The National Biodiversity Policy - NBP- flags conservation through protected areas (PA) as key to protecting this megadiversity and has established a goal to have 10% of each biome included in PAs. The predominant type of PA in Brazil is Conservation Units (UC). These have clearly defined biodiversity conservation objectives and specified management regimes. Since 2002, the 256 federal, state, and municipal UC have been brought under a National System of Conservation Units (SNUC). This sets a common framework for UC management and establishes 2 broad groups: those uninhabited PAs in which no use of biodiversity is allowed so as to provide strict protection; and inhabited PAs that focus on sustainable use of biodiversity as a means for conservation and protecting the communities dwelling in them."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Brazil tops the list for primates (55 spp.; 24% of world total) & *flowering plants* (55,000, 22%), and ranks 2<sup>nd</sup> in birds (1,622 spp.), 3<sup>rd</sup> in palms (387 spp), and 4<sup>th</sup> in reptiles (467spp).

"SNUC-PAs cover approximately 12% of the territory but do not include Brazil's **Indigenous Lands**<sup>3</sup> (ILs) which cover a *further* 12% of the country. Through the SNUC-PAs, 4.24% of Brazil is under strict protection categories (SP) and 7.22% under sustainable use categories (SU). However, these are not equally distributed across forest biomes nor do they include many sites defined as high priority for forest conservation. SNUC-PAs coverage of the different forest biomes are: Cerrado 2.43% under SP and 3.86% SU; the Caatinga 0.80% SP and 3.22% SU, Atlantic forest 1.57% SP and 4.34% SU, the Pantanal transition forests <1 SP %. Although at the biome level 6.78% of the Amazon is now under SNUC-PA in SP categories and 10.89% in SU categories, some constituent forest ecosystems are well below this target. This is of concern given the extremely high gama diversity of the Amazon that requires sufficient coverage and connectivity at the landscape level to protect species and ecosystem dynamics. Thus, although Brazil has expanded the SNUC-PA estate by 30% over the last 8 years this is not enough to achieve national goals and to protect some of the world's most important forests."

"While further growth of the SNUC will continue, land-tenure and financial constraints impede expansion to levels that meet bio-geographical coverage targets. Other types of PAs will be needed and Brazil's Indigenous lands represent a significant opportunity for achieving effective conservation of the country's forests. They promote the physical and cultural safety of indigenous people (IPs)-often referred to as ecosystem or forest people- and consequently, through indigenous traditional natural resource management strategies and cultural beliefs, these lands protect forest biodiversity and the services provided by these SNUC-PAs cover c. 12% of the territory but do not include Brazils Indigenous Lands4 (ILs) which cover a further 12% of the country. Through the SNUC-PAs, 4.24% of Brazil is under strict protection categories (SP) and 7.22% under sustainable-use categories (SU). However, these are not equally distributed across forest biomes nor do they include many sites defined as high priority for forest conservation. SNUC-PAs coverage of the different forest biomes are: Cerrado 2.43% under SP and 3.86% SU; the Caatinga 0.80% SP and 3.22% SU, Atlantic forest 1.57% SP and 4.34% SU, the Pantanal transition forests <1 SP %. Although at the biome level 6.78% of the Amazon is now under SNUC-PA in SP categories and 10.89% in SU categories, some constituent forest ecosystems are well below this target. This is of concern given the extremely high gamma diversity of the Amazon that requires sufficient coverage and connectivity at the landscape level to protect species and ecosystem dynamics. Thus, although Brazil has expanded the SNUC-PA estate by 30% over the last 8 years this is not enough to achieve national goals and to protect some of the world's most important forests."

"Recent studies confirm that ILs in Brazil are *de facto* protecting key forests, e.g., there is no strong difference on the control of deforestation between uninhabited SNUC parks and ILs in the Amazon despite the fact that many of the latter are located in the agricultural frontier<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, ILs covers as much, if not more area, than SNUC-PAs and many contain forests identified as priority for conservation<sup>6</sup>. Others are strategically located in sites critical for connectivity between SNUC PAs, or for inter-biome transition zones."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Under the Federal Constitution: "Lands traditionally occupied by Indians are those on which they live on a permanent basis, those used for their productive activities, those indispensable to the preservation of the environmental resources necessary for their well-being and for their physical and cultural reproduction, according to their uses, customs, and traditions". ILs have supremacy over other occupation and possession modalities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Under the Federal Constitution: "Lands traditionally occupied by Indians are those on which they live on a permanent basis, those used for their productive activities, those indispensable to the preservation of the environmental resources necessary for their well-being and for their physical and cultural reproduction, according to their uses, customs, and traditions". ILs have supremacy over other occupation and possession modalities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Nepstad, D. et al 2006 "Inhibition of Amzon deforestation and Fire by Parks and Indigenous Lands". Conservation Biology, V. 20 #1 pp 65-74

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Brazil's 560 ILs represent 69% of PA in the *Amazon*; 58% in the *Cerrado*; 29% in the *Caatinga*, 15% in the *Mata Atlântica*; PROBIO identified 3 priorities in the Amazon and ILs constitute 40% of Areas Extreme Importance, 36% of Very Great Importance, and 25% of Great Importance.

"Given their crucial role in forest conservation and to address ecosystem underrepresentativity in the PA estate, Brazil is seeking to complement protection of SNUC-PAs with that afforded by ILs. However, ILs are not complete guarantees of forest biodiversity conservation. Many are increasingly threatened by: (i) resource exploitation and land use in areas surrounding ILs, e.g., extensive cattle raising and expansion of soya and sugar cane; (ii) invasion of ILs for wood harvesting, expansion of farmland, gold-mining and other aggressive resource exploitation practices; (iii) extractive pressures within ILs particularly in those with reduced territories where pressures on limited resources are greatly intensified. In some cases, management strategies and capacities of IPs are insufficient for addressing these threats and some ILs have increasing levels of habitat degradation. Moreover, in all ILs, conservation of forest will depend on the continued employment of traditional agricultural practices. The normative solution is thus that ILs in Brazil are managed by IPs through differentiated PA management approaches that enable the continuation of cost-effective conservation of high priority forest and contribute in a measurable way to conservation goals based on a mix of conservation set-asides and sustainable-use practices that are appropriate to the forest type in which the ILs lie. A number of barriers impede this solution:

Weak systemic capacities for ILs to function as PAs	Brazil's National Protected Areas Plan (NPAP), approved in 2006, recognizes ILs' role in conservation but it does not include targets for contribution to goals or define strategies to enable this over the long term. In fact, ILs are not formally recognized as PAs and thus do not receive the support afforded to SNUC-PA for reducing threats. e.g., UCs have a buffer zone established by law and with specific regulations for land- use and strengthened surveillance and monitoring through partnerships between environmental institutions. In addition, ILs are not included within the mandate of these agencies, and thus IPs do not have systematic access to financial resources for environmental conservation and surveillance activities.
Weak operational procedures in ILs for measurable biodiversity conservation	There is a vast diversity of IPs <sup>4</sup> and different approaches to the observance of sacred areas in ILs where no extraction occurs. Many coincide with the areas of highest biodiversity; however, this is not always the case nor is their management undertaken in a way that facilitates gauging their contribution to biodiversity conservation. Some IPs have indicated their interest in recognizing these sacred sites, and others, as set-asides for conservation for which management plans would be developed based on ethno-management principles. Nevertheless, IP capacities for this are weak and there are few tested examples of effective approaches for the different biomes. Furthermore, indigenous engagement with government authorities that provide support in this arena is hampered as these governance systems are unfamiliar to many groups. Indigenous organizations have enabled some interaction between different institutional worlds but, given the range of IPs in Brazil, capacity is highly uneven.
Barriers to continuation of sustainable use of biodiversity	IPs` traditional management practices and knowledge for sustainable-use of biodiversity contributes to conserving habitats. However, the ability of many IPs to generate income based on these is impeded by poor access to markets in part due to lack of information on market conditions and in part due to weak capacities for negotiating and securing stable and minimum prices. The result is that these traditions are abandoned for practices that produce short-term profit but do not protect habitats. In some ILs, particularly those of reduced sizes, some production systems and extraction levels have increased to limits that threaten their sustainability. In others, degradation of land has meant that sustainable use is reduced to smaller areas changing the thresholds for sustainability.

Considering the need of Brazil to overcome these barriers, the project objective is that Indigenous Lands (ILs) are consolidated as protected areas critical to the conservation of Brazil's forest ecosystems and as an integral part of the National Protected Area Plan. This will be achieved through three main approaches."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 99% of total ILs area is in the Legal Amazon where 60% of Brazil's 400,000 indigenous people, divided into 215 peoples and speaking 180 native tongues, live; 40% live in the East, NE, SE, Central (Cerrado and Pantanal) and South in only 1% of the extension of ILs.

#### 2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The **Long Term Objective** of the Project is to catalyze the consolidation of Indigenous Lands (ILs) as essential protected areas for the conservation of biodiversity in Brazilian forest ecosystems and as a constituent part of the National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) and Environmental Management Policies for Indigenous Lands.

To that end, the project will strengthen ethno-environmental management, sustainable use and conservation of natural resources in these territories and promote social inclusion of these communities, thus fomenting a policy for environmental management in indigenous territories that increases their contribution to biodiversity conservation and the protection and safety of indigenous peoples' livelihoods.

The Purpose or **Immediate Objective** of the project is to put in place a ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity.

The Project will achieve this through the following three Outcomes and their related Outputs:

- Outcome 1: Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services.
- Outcome 2: A network of ILs modelling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations.
- Outcome 3: Sustainable and replicable models of forest management, based on ethnomanagement principles, are piloted in Reference Areas in different forest biomes.

#### 2.4 Baseline Indicators established

The baseline indicators are presented and commented below. The detailed logical framework with targets will be presented in section 3.1.1 Project Design/Formulation: Analysis of LFA/Results Framework. The achievements of the indicators' targets will be analyzed in section 3.3 Project Results,

Objective/ Outcome	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Comments
Immediate Objective: A ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity	<ol> <li>Increase in the area (ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs that by the end of the project are:         <ol> <li>incorporated into a network of ethno-management practices for conservation of different forest ecosystems in Brazil;</li> <li>identified as contributing to long term targets of PNAP and part of the IL Environmental Management Plan with specific strategies for implementation.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Currently ILs in different forest biomes support the conservation of forest biodiversity but the contribution to national conservation plans and targets is not measured nor are the IP management practices readily translated into terms that can be recognized and funded through the resources available for biodiversity conservation. The potential for contribution to Brazil's conservation goals is thus not fully recognized.</li> <li>% of Biome under protection in Natural Reserves and in Indigenous Lands:</li> <li>Biome: NR IL Cerrado/P: 6% 8% Caatinga: 3,5% 2,5% At.Forest: 4% 3% Amazon: 14% 21%</li> </ol>	The baseline shows the percentage of each Biome under protection in Natural Reserves and Indigenous Lands. In the case of the Caatinga and the Atlantic Forest the percentage in ILs is only 1 point lower than in NR, while it's two points higher in the Cerrado and seven points higher in the Amazon. Thus, it becomes clear that a better recognition of indigenous environmental management of ILs and of their conservation role would mean a huge contribution to national conservation plans and targets
		see cells below % of  # ILs in network   % of ha ILs in network   % of ha IL in plan	
	Cerrrado/P.	6.0   8.0   0.0	
	Caatinga	3.5   2.5   0.0	
	Atlantic Forest	4.0   3.0   0.0	

	Amazon	14.0   21.0   0.0	
	2. % forest cover in ILs that serve as Reference Areas (RA) <sup>8</sup> remains at least same or increases (as measured by Satellite images) RA 1 RA 2 RA 3 RA 4 RA 5 RA 6 RA 7 RA 8 RA 9 RA 10 [more accurate estimates of forest cover will be determined as part of ethno management plans and some adjustments may be made to figures]	RA 1 98% RA 2 98% RA 3 98% RA 4 60% RA 5 40% RA 6 90% RA 7 45% RA 8 90% RA 9 98% RA 1 40%	The following of this indicator depends on the satellite images monitoring.
	3. Increased management effectiveness (according to the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool – METT) in ILs that serve as Reference Areas: RA 1 RA 2 RA 3 RA 4 RA 5 RA 6 RA 7 RA 8 RA 9 RA 10	RA 1 64 RA 2 69 RA 378 RA 4 80 RA 5 83 RA 6 64 RA 7 34 RA 8 64 RA 9 71 RA 10 44	This baseline was built upon the METT application. Please see METT application analysis in section 3.1.3 and section 4.
	<ul> <li>4. Increase in IP capacities for leading and up- scaling environmental management actions for conserving representative forest ecosystems in Brazil</li> <li>IOs, with institutional &amp; technical capacities to execute &amp; monitor IL National Plans &amp;projects</li> <li>Indigenous initiatives/centres for training in environmental management for BD conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Today COIAB, FOIRN and CIR have institutional capacity for the execution of ethno-management and ethno-zoning plans. None has the capacity to execute a national plan of environmental management.</li> <li>A Centre for Indigenous training exists in the Amazon CAFI and in 2006 trained 15 IPs in environmental management but this does not include standards and practices for ethno-zoning for BD conservation. Other regions do not have Centres or trained IPs.</li> </ul>	
Outcome 1:	5. Existence of recognized environmental management standards and targets in ILs	A National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) exists to guide the establishment of a	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> The total number of Reference Areas (indigenous lands) was increased from 10 to 32. The original 10, arranged according to the name of the IL followed by its state, were: Mamoadate (AC), Igarapé Lourdes (RO), Andirá-Marau (AM/PA), Ibirama (SC), Bracuí (RJ), Guaraní do Riberão Silveira (SP), Entre-Serras de Pankararu (PE), Caramuru-Paraguaçu (BA), Pirakuá (MS) e Lalima (MS). Others 22 indigenous lands were added due requests from indigenous representatives: -TIs Xerente (TO), Xambioá (TO), Bakairi (MT), Jumina, Galibi e Uaçá (AP/Oiapoque), Trincheira-Bacajá (PA), Wajãpi (AP), Kiriri (BA), Potiguara (PB), Caiçara/Ilha de São Pedro (SE/AL), Córrego de João Pereira (CE), TIs Xacriabá (MG), Caieiras Velhas II (ES), Caramuru-Paraguaçu (BA), Cachoeirinha, Jaguapiré, Sassoró , Taunay (MS), Mangueirinha and Ava-Guarani de Oco'y (PR) and Aaribá (SP).

Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving		comprehensive system of protected areas including contributions from ILs but no specific targets, standards or practices for these are defined. In Sept 2008, an interministerial working group (GTI) was established to elaborate a proposal for a National Policy for Environmental Management in IL	
forest biodiversity, natural resources and environmental services	6. Resources from existing biodiversity conservation sources used to achieve basic operating standards for environmental management in ILs	ILs currently do not receive funding for environmental management activities from public funding sources for biodiversity conservation. There is isolated support from NGOs to undertake environmental management and/or territorial surveillance activities in the ILs of Oiapoque, Amapá and Kayapó <sup>3</sup>	
	7. Staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio, FUNAI, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) aligned to implement and follow specific norms and regulations for ethno-management and ethno-zoning in ILs.	see data below	The indicator is related to many different institutions. The institutional context makes the monitoring of the competencies and skills levels difficult to follow.
		<20% of MMA/SBF trained in ethno- management and ethno-zoning plans for IIs	
	See above	<15% of FUNAI has core groups of staff trained in environmental management and sustainable use activities in IL	
		OEMAs do not have staff trained on environmental activities in IIs	
		IBAMA and ICMBio	
		Staff requirements in MMA/SBF and FUNAI do not include profiles for IL/IP and biodiversity conservation, respectively	

	<ul> <li>8. Regulations adopted for environmental management in ILs including regulations on:</li> <li>ethno zoning in ILs</li> <li>land-use in areas surrounding ILs</li> <li>management of overlapping IL and UCs</li> <li>sustainable use of forest resources of IL</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0</li> <li>0 i.e., these different regulations do not exist.</li> </ul>	•
	9. Existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of ethno zoning and plans	<ul> <li>Only ILs that were part of PPTAL in the Amazon have surveillance and monitoring protocols and carry out inspection activities in ILs but these do not contain environmental monitoring nor are they related to specific ethnozones and their goals.</li> <li>ILs in other forest biomes do not have surveillance and monitoring protocols and only have Indigenous Surveillance (observation) Stations that are not related to zoning.</li> </ul>	
Outcome 2:	10. Number of ethno-management plans in ILs that		
A network of ILs modeling environmental management	<ul> <li>developed and tested;</li> <li>have defined conservation goals;</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 communities in Oiapoque are testing environmental management strategies</li> <li>0 with defined conservation goals</li> </ul>	•
practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations	<ul> <li>are officially recognized as meeting established norms for conservation by environmental and indigenous agencies in each region.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Today about 60% of the RAs have conserved areas but their contribution to biodiversity conservation is not measured nor recognized officially by relevant institutions (e.g., FUNAI and IBAMA/OEMAS)</li> </ul>	
	11. Degree of replication of experiences from Reference Areas to other ILs that improve	METT for a sample of 23 ILs: Poor: 0 Fair: 9 Good: 9 Excellent: 5	Please see the MEET discussion in section 3.1.1.

	management effectiveness as measured by increase in the METT scores of a sample of 23 ILS		
	12. % of indigenous curricula that include information on BD & environmental management		Please see the discussion about the curricula in section 3.1.1.
	IP schools in network	• 0% of 30 (at least 1 per IL of network)	
	IP schools nationwide	• 0% of 2422 (FNDE 2006)	•
	IP training centers (CFI)	<ul> <li>1 for the whole Amazon region.</li> </ul>	
Outcome 3: Sustainable and	13. Reduction in unsustainable extractive practices in the RAs	The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans	This indicator had no baseline at the beginning of the project.
replicable models of forest management , based on ethno- management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes	14. Increase in the % of IP diet derived from the new agro-ecological production systems in IL Reference Areas in the Caatinga, Cerrado and A.F	IPs in Amazon get food from within the IL. IPs diet in the Cerrado and the Atlantic Forest comes from locally grown crops and food bought in regional markets IPs in Caatinga grow and gather food in IL, exerting high pressure on the few resources available [Base line values will be established by ethno-zoning & ethno-management plans]	The same situation above.
	15. Increase in the income derived from the trade of NTFP, including: Honey (melipona) Fruit: Cashew, açaí, baru Handicrafts: liana, croá	Note: The exact value of the income will be measured by end of year 1 Acai - R\$9.6-/1 lt conc Native Bee Honey - R\$18.50/235g Babaçu soap - R\$2.00/90g Baru nut toasted - R\$12.00/200g Capim Dourado bag - R\$56/19x13x7cm Caatinga Croá - R\$20.00/1m <sup>2</sup>	The baseline was established according to some prices. Nevertheless, the values can show regional discrepancies. The formulation of this indicator didn't consider the difficulties to measure indigenous families' incomes. A more detailed critique can be found in section 3.1.1.
	16. Area of fragmented forest restored in IL of Atlantic forest with native species to improve connectivity	The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans	This indicator had no baseline at the beginning of the project.

#### 2.5 Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders include: indigenous organizations, such as the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (APIB), the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB), the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the South (ARPIN-SUL), the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Northeast, Minas Gerais and Espirito Santo (APOINME), the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Pantanal and its Region (ARPINPAN); NGOs and other civil society organizations (TNC, CI, ISPN, IEB, Iepé) and relevant governmental agencies working on indigenous issues and the environment (MMA, FUNAI, ICMBio, MDS). The main stakeholders participated in the Project Steering Committee and worked closely with the Project Management Unit (PMU).

#### 2.6 Expected Results

According to the ProDoc, the project components, outcomes and outputs are stated below<sup>9</sup>:

## "Outcome 1. Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services.

One of the key barriers identified during project development is that existing government policies are not always supportive of the efforts of indigenous peoples to tackle threats to the ecological and cultural integrity of ILs, especially those that relate to pressures on ILs from the surrounding landscape. Indigenous lands have a unique status and government policies need to be cognizant of this. Further, supportive policies and regulations need to be accompanied by suites of tools and instruments that can be readily applied by IPs and the range of Governmental institutions with responsibilities related to ILs and biodiversity conservation. In addition, there needs to be strengthened capacities among both IPs and these government staff, if policies are to be effectively implemented. Therefore, this Outcome seeks to put in place supportive government policies and regulations, as well as to strengthen institutional capacities and increase access to financial resources so that ILs and IPs can continue to be effective stewards of biodiversity. To ensure that the systemic level interventions of this Outcome are responsive to the different needs, characteristics, threats of the different indigenous groups and forest biomes, this Outcome draw on the field-level experiences from the different RAs that will be a representative sample of the differing needs (Outcomes 2 and 3).

#### Outputs:

**1.1.** Defined guidelines, strategies and legal procedures for areas that are destined for conservation and sustainable use within ILs.

**1.2.** Sustainable financing strategies developed for the continuation of ethnoenvironmental management within ILs

**1.3.** Capacities of indigenous people and government counterparts are strengthened for fulfilling new roles and procedures for ILs.

**1.4.** Surveillance and protection against invasion, and biodiversity impact monitoring protocols strengthened in the ILs and surrounding areas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> All the descriptions of outcomes and outputs were taken from the Project Document (PIMS3600) – BRA/09/G32 – Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems. UNDP – GEF.

# Outcome 2. A network of ILs modeling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations.

This outcome is focused on piloting ethno-environmental management in selected ILs to ensure that IPs and government counterparts have a solid body of experience in promoting sound integrated management of the entire territory of ILs in different forest biomes, thereby fully realizing their biodiversity conservation potential. The selected ILs will serve as Reference Areas (RA) for indigenous plans for territorial and environmental management and the development of the capacities of IPs to design and implement environmental plans, including ethno-zoning activities. These territorial management plans define conservation and sustainable use areas: sacred areas, forest areas, farming and extractive areas, areas for reforestation, areas for the recovery of biota, among others.

#### Outputs:

**2.1.** Ethno-management plans, including zoning, developed for selected ILs by Indigenous Environmental Agents & recognized by FUNAI, MMA, IBAMA, ICMBIO.

**2.2.** National and regional networks of ethno-management practitioners established to replicate activities and mechanisms aimed at conservation within ILs.

**2.3.** Capacity building for the territorial and environmental management of consolidated ILs.

**2.4.** Awareness raising programme on the impact of extractivism on the condition and ecosystem services of areas destined for conservation.

#### Outcome 3. Sustainable and replicable models of forest management, based on ethnomanagement principles, are piloted in Reference Areas from different forest biomes.

This outcome is focused on piloting sustainable models of forest use (for subsistence and commercialization) based on ethno-environmental management principles in Reference Areas (RAs). It will be implemented in the same RAs identified under Outcome 2, following the same process and criteria for selection. The aim is to improve the conservation role of ILs, and also, by enhancing sustainable use possibilities, improve the socio-economic situation of IPs.

#### Outputs:

**3.1.** Recovery of degraded areas piloted in RAs that require specific landscape management to lever their contribution to biodiversity conservation.

**3.2.** Piloting of agroecological techniques, applying the traditional knowledge to agriculture and to use of forest resources for subsistence.

**3.3.** Demonstration of mechanisms to promote production and increased access of indigenous products to the market.

**3.4.** Indigenous leadership and community members trained in carrying out sustainable use activities and managing commercialization."

## 3 Findings

#### 3.1 Project Design / Formulation

The Project design is based on the commitment of the Brazilian Government, pledged during the Seventh Conference of the Parties - COP 7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) held in Malaysia, in February 2004, to adopt the CBD's Work Programme for Protected Areas (Decision VII / 28). This Work Program aims to establish and maintain, by 2010, regarding terrestrial areas, and by 2012, regarding marine areas, national and regional systems of protected areas that are comprehensive, effectively managed and ecologically representative.

For the implementation of the CBD Work Program, the Brazilian Government undertook to formulate a National Plan, an instrument defining principles, guidelines and objectives that would lead the country to reduce the rate of biodiversity loss through the consolidation of a system of protected areas that is comprehensive, ecologically representative and effectively managed, integrated into broader land and seascapes, by 2015. Thus, the **National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas (PNAP)**, constitutes a tool for implementation of the CBD Work Program for Protected Areas, and was based on deliberations related to:

- the World Summit for Sustainable Development WSSD;
- the Strategic Plan for the Convention on Biological Diversity (protection of at least 10% of each eco-region by 2010);
- National Environmental Conferences / CNMAs (2003 and 2005).

However, the pressure of the indigenous movement predates this commitment by the government. Since 2003, indigenous organizations, led by the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB), which at the time was the most active in indigenous coordination and was supported by TNC, began negotiations with the Ministry of Environment (MMA) in order to obtain support in the preparation and proposal of a more comprehensive project for Brazilian Indigenous Lands, going beyond the Amazon. The idea was to convince the government of the role of Indigenous Lands in curbing deforestation and in biodiversity conservation, and to develop an indigenous program, along the lines of the Amazon Region Protected Areas Program (ARPA), which only covers Conservation Units. It would be an "Indigenous-GEF", as it became known at the beginning of discussions.

Between 2003 and 2008, in a context more favorable to indigenous demands, the MMA was recognizing indigenous communities as partners of the government in the fight against deforestation in the Amazon and in biodiversity protection. Even though ILs are not part of the National System of Protected Areas (SNUC), the MMA recognized the environmental function of ILs due to the following factors:

- extension of ILs, which at the time (2006) represented 12.5% of the national territory (20.7% of the Legal Amazon), while only 4.7% of that territory was protected in federal conservation units;
- the variety of ecosystems included within ILs in all biomes;
- the conservation status of ILs and their natural resources; and
- the importance of the connectivity between Conservation Units (UCs), Indigenous Lands (ILs), and other protected areas.

However, as they are not part of the National System of Protected Areas (SNUC), ILs were also excluded from environmental policies, thus limiting the access of indigenous peoples to financial resources for institutional strengthening, conservation and management of these areas. In order to change this situation and ensure greater integration among Conservation

Units (UCs), Indigenous Lands (ILs), and *Quilombo* Lands<sup>10</sup>, the MMA had been discussing with indigenous organizations the preparation of a *National Program of Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in ILs* under the National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas - PNAP, which was signed in 2006 (Decree 5,758 / 2006).

The immediate objective of the program under discussion was the consolidation of ILs as protected areas, supporting indigenous initiatives of environmental conservation and recovery, valuing traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples, their innovations and practices, and promoting the ethno-management of biodiversity within ILs. The methodologies and tools included a broad consultative process among indigenous peoples and organizations, greater coordination among indigenous organizations and the various government agencies working with biodiversity conservation in ILs, development of ethno-inventories, ethno-zoning, and indigenous plans for the management of territories, as well as indigenous systems of protected areas, aiming at the protection of traditional sites and / or voluntarily setting aside areas for biodiversity conservation within ILs.

In this context, the MMA created an Interministerial Working Group (IWG) composed of indigenous representatives, with the participation of FUNAI and IBAMA, to prepare the proposal for the "Indigenous GEF" project to be submitted to the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). It would support the implementation of the National Program for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in ILs under the PNAP and test methodologies and instruments of protection and management of indigenous lands.

The Project proposal was approved by GEF in May 2009 and the ProDoc in August of that year, having been signed by the parties in October 2009. Soon after the completion of the Project's institutional framework, the Steering Committee was set up in June 2010.

The project was designed specifying activities to be carried out over a period of five years, with completion originally scheduled for October, 2014. The final operational closing date was revised to July, then August, 2016, according to the Substantial Revison of BRA/09/G32.

This context of preparing the proposal supported the **formulation of a set of indicators** to measure the performance of some sort of indigenous system of protected areas or areas voluntarily set aside for biodiversity conservation within ILs (following the "set-aside" strategy). However, with time and because it does not represent a priority for indigenous actors, since they fight for the protection and sustainable use of all of their lands, this conservationist bias began to lose ground in the discussions between indigenous organizations and the government. The Project supported discussions and five regional consultations with indigenous organizations, which resulted in the development of the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI), between 2008 and 2010, which, in turn, was signed by President Lula in 2012 (Decree 7747/2012).

Thus, one can see that the Project objectives and components were clear, however, the outputs of Outcome 2, which focus on *conservation set-asides*, were not quite feasible in terms of the maturity of discussions within the PNGATI. Likewise, the respective indicators did not follow the criteria of simplicity, objectivity and measurability (criteria that represent key aspects of "SMART" indicators) and were written in an overly complex manner. The METT tracking tool also proved ill-suited to the context of ILs, which do not have the figure of a "manager" or "park manager" and entail specific aspects of environmental management.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Quilombo communities are descendants of African slaves who were brought to Brazil in order to work in the colonial period, and who after escaping or as a result of the abolition of slavery, settled on lands that were collectively managed and became spaces of residence, resistance and social organization. The Brazilian Constitution recognizes the land rights of these communities.

### 3.1.1 Analysis of LFA / Results Framework

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions			
LONG TERM OBJECTIVE	Consolidation of Indigenous Lands (ILs) as essential protected areas for the conservation of biodiversity in Brazilian forest ecosystems and as constituer part of the National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) and Environmental Management Policies for Indigenous Lands.							
IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE: A ground- tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity	<ol> <li>Increase in the area (ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs that by the end of the project are:         <ul> <li>(i) incorporated into a network of ethno- management practices for conservation of different forest ecosystems in Brazil</li> <li>(ii) identified as contributing to long term targets of PNAP and part of IL Environmental Management Plan with specific strategies for implementation</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Currently ILs in different forest biomes provide conservation to forest biodiversity but the contribution to national conservation plans and targets is not measured nor are the IPs management practices readily translated into terms that can be recognized and funded through resources available for biodiversity conservation. The potential for contribution to Brazil' conservation goals is thus not fully recognized.</li> <li>% of biome under protection in SNUC*; in all ILs; and that is currently measured &amp; recognized conservation network</li> <li>Biome % ha % ha % of # and ha ILs in network</li> <li>Cerrado/P 6.0 8.0 0</li> <li>** Cerrado 14.0 21.0 0</li> <li>*SNUC is the Brazilian National Protected Area System</li> <li>** This includes ILs in the Pantanal with transition forest</li> </ol>	Biome(i) ILs (ha) in network with recognized BD goals(ii) ILs (ha) in long term plans1Cerrado/P186,542559,626Caatinga87,620262,860Atl. Forest194,064582,192Amazon4,128,83312,386,499These will be determined as part of the Project. But here an estimate is made that, at the end of the project, the area in the plan will be triple that in the network(iii) % contribution to conservation goalsBiomeIL s in IL s in network network plan * Cerrado/PCerrado/P100.090.27 **Caatinga50.100.100.30Atl. Forest60.170.100.093.00	<ul> <li>1.(i) Project Reports; approved ethno- management plans; BD monitoring reports</li> <li>1. (ii) Relevant sections of the IL Environmental Management Plan and NPAP</li> </ul>	-The government main- tains current commitment to work as a partner of the IPs to ensure conservation in ILs. -The IPs continue parti- cipating in conservation of ILs and show at least current levels of interest for engagement with project -IPs continue to show a unified and consistent voice through the regional IOs- Indigenous Organizations -IOs have sufficient capacities to participate in the execution and moni- toring of the National IL Environmental Manage- ment Plan thereby up- scaling lessons learnt through project to fully unleash IL contribution to conservation targets -Climate changes negatively affect the biodiversity in ILs			

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline				Target		Verification Sources	Assumptions
	2. % forest cover ILs that serve as Reference Areas	IL (RA) 11	% forest cover	METT <sup>12</sup>	IL (RA)	% forest cover	METT	2.Satellite images and	
	same or more (as	1	98	64	1	98	>77	management	
	measured by Satellite	2	98	69	2	98	>77	plans and	
	images)	3	98	78	3	98	>85	monitoring	
		4	60	80	4	70	>90	systems	
	[more accurate estimates	5	40	83	5	50	>90		
	of forest cover will be	6	90	64	6	90	>77		
	ethno management plans	7	45	34	7	55	>52		
	and some adjustments	8	90	64	8	90	>77		
	may be made to figures]	9	98	71	9	98	>77		
		10	40	44	10	50	>52		
	3. Increased manage- ment effectiveness in ILs that serve as Reference Areas	See table i	n row above		See table	e in row above		3. Adapted METTS	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> The total number of Reference Areas (indigenous lands) was increased from 10 to 32. The original 10, arranged according to the name of the IL followed by its state, were: Mamoadate (AC), Igarapé Lourdes (RO), Andirá-Marau (AM/PA), Ibirama (SC), Bracuí (RJ), Guaraní do Riberão Silveira (SP), Entre-Serras de Pankararu (PE), Caramuru-Paraguaçu (BA), Pirakuá (MS) e Lalima (MS). Others 22 indigenous lands were added due requests from indigenous representatives: -TIs Xerente (TO), Xambioá (TO), Bakairi (MT), Jumina, Galibi e Uaçá (AP/Oiapoque), Trincheira-Bacajá (PA), Wajãpi (AP), Kiriri (BA), Potiguara (PB), Caiçara/Ilha de São Pedro (SE/AL), Córrego de João Pereira (CE), TIs Xacriabá (MG), Caieiras Velhas II (ES), Caramuru-Paraguaçu (BA), Cachoeirinha, Jaguapiré, Sassoró , Taunay (MS), Mangueirinha and Ava-Guarani de Oco'y (PR) and Aaribá (SP).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The ranges were established using the WB/WWF METT slightly adapted to better fit the ILs. Total points = 87 points, including additional items and excluding questions 24, 25 and 26. Poor= < 25% (0–22 points); Fair=26–50%: (23–43 pts), Good= 51–76%: (44-66 pts); Excellent= 77–100%: (67-87 pts)- see ANNEX 6 on the METTs. Management effectiveness tools designed for IL will be developed as part of the project to more accurately measure strengthened management

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	<ul> <li>4. Increase in IP capacities for leading and up-scaling environmental management actions for conserving representative forest ecosystems in Brazil</li> <li>1. IOs, with institutional &amp;technical capacities to execute &amp; monitor IL National Plans &amp; projects</li> <li>2. Indigenous initiatives/centres for training in environmental management for BD conservation &amp; sustainable use of natural resources</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Today COIAB, FOIRN and CIR have institutional capacity for the execution of ethno-management and ethno- zoning plans. None has the capacity to execute a national plan of environmental management.</li> <li>A Centre for Indigenous training exists in the Amazon CAFI and in 2006 trained 15 IPs in environmental management but this does not include standards and practices for ethno- zoning for BD conservation. Other regions do not have Centres or trained IPs</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>5. All IO of the 5 regional networks have strengthened capacities* for environmental management and to execute &amp; monitor IL National Plans &amp; projects.</li> <li>6. 20 IP in each of the biomes have skill* required for ethno-environmental management</li> <li>* This will be measured by a scorecard to be developed as part of the project's Output 1.4</li> </ul>	Staff profiles in IOs Certificates of Course Completion in the CFIs Scorecards to be developed in project and applied at end of year 1; mid- term and end of project	
OUTCOME 1 Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural	5.Existence of recognized environmental management standards and targets in Indigenous Lands	A National Protected Areas Plan (PNAP) exists to guide the establishment of a comprehensive system of protected areas including contributions from ILs s but no specific targets, standards or practices for these are defined. In Sept 2008, a working group (GTI) was established to elaborate a proposal of National Policy for Environmental Management in IL	A National Conservation Plan for Indigenous Lands that contains targets for conservation of representative forest ecosystems through environmental management * exists and is harmonized and integrated with the NPAP and adapted to the environmental and social needs of ILs * <i>this Plan would be aligned with and</i> <i>form part of a National Policy on</i> <i>Environmental Management of IL</i> <i>(PNGATI)</i>	National Policy for Environmental Policy in ILs (PNGATI) IL Conservation Plan Proceedings of FUNAI and MMA/SBF on harmonizing Plans Project Reports.	-National Policy on Environmental Management in ILs is developed in timely manner with support from FUNAI and MMA thereby increasing the dialogue on more effective environmental management -State Environmental Agencies incorporate the new policies to support ethno- management plans at

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
resources and the environmental services	6. Resources from existing biodiversity conservation sources used to achieve basic operating standards for environmental management in ILs	ILs currently do not receive funding for environmental management activities from public funding sources for biodiversity conservation. Isolated support from NGOs to undertake environmental management and/or territorial surveillance activities in the ILs of Oiapoque, Amapá and Kayapó	At least 5 of the Reference ILs will receive at least 50% of the costs of basic operations* from new funding mechanisms that include resources currently only available for biodiversity conservation in PA and environmental services compensation *The project will work to determine costs of meeting basic operational standards and will test different funding mechanisms.	Budget resources from FUNAI and MMA destined to environmental management in IL. Financial reports of ILs	levels that enable the replication of experiences across all States -Contribution of ILs to BD in each forest biome is successfully measured in IL. RA during the project life -Increase in the public
	7. Staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio, FUNAI, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) aligned to implement and follow specific norms and regulations for ethno- management and ethno- zoning in ILs.	<ol> <li>&lt;20% of MMA/SBF trained on ethno-management and ethno- zoning plans for ILs</li> <li>&lt;15% of FUNAI has core groups of staff trained on environmental management and sustainable use activities in IL</li> <li>OEMAs do not have staff trained on environmental activities in ILs</li> <li>IBAMA and ICMBio</li> <li>Staff requirements in MMA/SBF and FUNAI do not include profiles for IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>At least 20% increase in the number of MMA and FUNAI staff trained to implement and use such norms</li> <li>At least 1 staff member in the OEMAs of the states of SC, MS, BA, PE, AM, PA, AC and RO trained to monitor these norms and regulations</li> <li>IBAMA and ICMBio</li> <li>Competency profiles for MMA/SF and FUNAI have been adjusted to include IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively</li> </ol>	Project Reports; report on the development of qualification programs. Annual monitoring reports. Legal register of the submissions to the judiciary.	support new strategies of environmental management is at levels high enough to upscale experiences from RA
	<ol> <li>Regulations adopted for environmental management in ILs including regulations on:</li> <li>7. ethno zoning in ILs</li> <li>8. land-use in areas surrounding ILs</li> </ol>	11. 0 12. 0 13. 0 14. 0	<ul> <li>15. At least 3 categories of ethno- zoning recognized for: conservation, sustainable use and restoration.</li> <li>16. At least 1 regulation regarding land-use in the areas surrounding ILs e.g creation o IL buffers zones</li> </ul>	8. Specific decrees instituting each of these regulations	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	<ol> <li>9. management of overlapping IL and UCs</li> <li>10. sustainable use of forest resources of IL</li> </ol>		<ol> <li>Norms on homologizing management plans and ethno- plans of IL and UC</li> <li>Agreed-upon standards and limits for use of forest resources</li> </ol>		
	9. Existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of ethno zoning and plans	<ol> <li>Only ILs that were part of PPTAL in the Amazon have surveillance and monitoring protocols and carry out inspection activities in ILs but these do not contain environmental monitoring nor are they related to specific ethno- zones and their goals</li> <li>ILs in other forest biomes do not have surveillance and monitoring protocols and only have Indigenous Surveillance (observation) Stations that are not related to zoning</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>All the IL reference areas have established surveillance Protocols and undertaken environmental monitoring</li> <li>50% of the ILs composing the network have established Surveillance Protocols and are developing environmental monitoring systems</li> </ol>	Environmental monitoring reports Surveillance Protocols METT Project Reports	
OUTCOME 2: A network of ILs modelling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being affectively	<ol> <li>Number of ethnomanagement plans in ILs that are:</li> <li>developed and tested</li> <li>have defined conservation goals</li> <li>are officially recognized as meeting established norms for conservation by environmental and indigenous agencies in each regional</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>5 communities in Oiapoque are testing environmental management strategies</li> <li>0</li> <li>Today about 60% of the RAs have conserved areas but their contribution to biodiversity conservation is not measure not recognized officially by relevant institutions ( eg FUNAI and IBAMA/OEMAS)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>10 tested ethno-management plan with defined sustainable use, conservation practices, zones and goals relevant for each of the four forest biomes</li> <li>30 more ILs developing ethno management plans</li> <li>All plans in reference areas are officially recognized as meeting norms by environmental agencies in each region</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ethno- managemen t Plans and Ethno- zoning maps</li> <li>Project Reports</li> <li>Official documents recognizing Plans</li> </ul>	-Implementation of the ethno-management plans effectively demonstrate the contribution of ILs to conservation of BD -Ethno-management experiences are efficient and guarantee high replicability
managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations	11. Degree of replication of experiences from Reference Areas to other ILs that improve	METT for a sample of 23 ILs: Poor: 0 Fair: 9	All Poor and Fair have reached at least Good Scores All Good have reached Excellent Scores	METT reports	-Coordination processes allow an efficient replicability and

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
	management effectiveness as measured by increase in the METT scores of a sample of 23 ILS	Good: 9 Excellent: 5	All Excellent have remained Excellent		exchange of experiences within the life time of the project at regional and national
12. % of indigenous curricula that include information on BD & environmental management 26.IP schools in network 27.IP schools nationwide 28.IP training centers (CFI)29. 0% of 30 (at least 1 per IL of network) 30. 0% of 2422 (FNDE 2006) 31. 1 for the whole Amazon region.		<ul><li>32. 50% of IP schools in network</li><li>33. 10% IP schools across country</li><li>34. 100% of 5 CFI</li></ul>	School levels     curricula     CAFI     curricula     Project     reports		
OUTCOME 3 Sustainable and replicable	13. Reduction in un- sustainable extractive practices in the RAs	The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans	100% reduction in the <i>caatinga</i> , <i>cerrado</i> Atlantic forest and in the Amazon biome.	Project reports and ethno monitoring reports	-Fragmented areas subject to restoration activities show the conservation of BD
models of forest management, based on ethno- management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes	14. Increase in the % of IP diet derived from the new agro-ecological production systems in ILs Reference Areas in the Caatinga, Cerrado and Atlantic Forest	IPs in Amazon get food from in the IL. IPs diet in Cerrado and the Atlantic Forest comes from locally grown crops and food bought in regional markets IPs in Caatinga grow and gather food in IL, exerting high pressure on the few resources available Base line values will be established by ethno-zoning & ethno-management plans	Community inside IL subsist with production derived from agro- ecological production within the zones delimited for this use	Project Reports	-Pressure on natural resources in ILs increases as new resource use-options become more effective. -Population levels in some ILs are at levels that enable new agro- ecological options to
	<ol> <li>15. Increase in the income derived from the trade of NTFP, including:</li> <li>35. Honey (melipona)</li> <li>36. Fruit: Cashew, açaí, baru</li> <li>37. Handicraft: liana, croá</li> </ol>	Income unknown at present. Unit prices are Açaí 1 I 9.60 Native Bee 235g 18.50 Honey Babaçu 90g 2.00 soap Baru nut 200g 12,00 C toasted	<ul> <li>ILs in Cerrado, Caatinga, and Atlantic Forest with at least one income-generating agro-ecological activity</li> <li>In the Amazon, 3 of the 4 RAs with trading activities implemented</li> </ul>	- Adapted METT and Project Reports - Amount of Income	cover dietary needs and this reduce deforestation

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verification Sources	Assumptions
		Capim Dourado bag19x13x7 cm56.00Caainga Croá1m² 20.0020.00Note:The exact value of the income will be measured by end of year 1.			
	16. Area of fragmented forest restored in IL of A. forest with native species to improve connectivity	The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans	At least 40% of the fragmented areas that are critical to connectivity are in the process of restoration with native species	Project Reports IL Environ- mental monitoring reports	

#### Analysis of indicator design

The evaluation mission identified some indicators with design problems, which will be analyzed below (*in italics*).

#### IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE:

A ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity.

Indicators (underlined)

1. Increase in the area (ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs that by the end of the project are:

(i) incorporated into a network of ethno-management practices for conservation of different forest ecosystems in Brazil

(ii) identified as contributing to long term targets of PNAP and part of IL Environmental Management Plan with specific strategies for implementation

(iii) % contribution to conservation goals

Analysis: all three indicators are correct.

2. % forest cover in ILs that serve as Reference Areas (RA) remains at least the same or increases (as measured by satellite images)

[more accurate estimates of forest cover will be determined as part of ethno management plans and some adjustments may be made to figures]

	Baseline			Target	
IL (RA) 13	% forest cover	METT <sup>14</sup>	IL (RA)	% forest cover	METT
1	98	64	1	98	>77
2	98	69	2	98	>77
3	98	78	3	98	>85
4	60	80	4	70	>90
5	40	83	5	50	>90
6	90	64	6	90	>77
7	45	34	7	55	>52
8	90	64	8	90	>77
9	98	71	9	98	77
10	40	44	10	50	>52

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> RA: Amazon: 1.Mamoadate, 2.Igarapé Lourdes, 3.Andirá Marau. Cerrado/Pantanal: 4.Pirakuá, 5.Lalima. Atlantic Forest: 6.Xocleng de Ibirama, 7.Caramuru-Paraguaçu, 8.Guarani do Ribeirão Silveira, 9.Guarani do Bracui. Caatinga: 10.Pankararu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> The ranges were established using the WB/WWF METT slightly adapted to better fit the ILs. Total points = 87 points, including additional items and excluding questions 24, 25 and 26. Poor= < 25% (0– 22 points); Fair=26–50%: (23–43 pts), Good= 51–76%: (44-66 pts); Excellent= 77–100%: (67-87 pts)-see ANNEX 6 on the METTs. Management effectiveness tools designed for IL will be developed as part of the project to more accurately measure strengthened management

<u>3. Increased management effectiveness in ILs that serve as Reference Areas</u> See table above.

Analysis: Inconclusive indicator due to the use of an inadequate tool (METT) for the measurement of the effect of environmental management on the conservation of biological diversity. Despite the adjustment of the tool in 2013, the baseline was established with a previous version of the tool, and was not adjusted, making it impossible to compare.

4. Increase in IP capacities for leading and up-scaling environmental management actions for conserving representative forest ecosystems in Brazil indigwenous organizations (IOs), with institutional &technical capacities to execute & monitor IL National Plans & projects Indigenous initiatives/centres for training in environmental management for BD conservation & sustainable use of natural resources.

Targets:

1 - All IO of the 5 regional networks have strengthened capacities\* for environmental management and to execute & monitor IL National Plans & projects.

2- 20 IP in each of the biomes have skill\* required for ethno-environmental management

\*This will be measured by a scorecard to be developed as part of the project's Output 1.4

#### Analysis:

1 - The indicator/target is not measurable. The sense of "strengthened" does not correspond to a verifiable pattern. The training of a member of the organization can be considered strengthening. There is no way to measure this strengthening in practice.

2 -The second target is also difficult to measure. Firstly, the construction of physical training centers does not indicate increased skills. Holding practical training is a better activity to indicate increased knowledge, but it should be measured by evaluating the participants. Some training centers were built, however, the best indicator would be training courses conducted. Again, the adapted METT should have been used from the beginning of the Project (to conform to baseline) in order to verify the impact of training on environmental management. However, the METT was modified only halfway through Project execution, and was applied once.

#### OUTCOME 1

Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services

## 5.Existence of recognized environmental management standards and targets in Indigenous Lands

#### Target

A National Conservation Plan for Indigenous Lands that contains targets for conservation of representative forest ecosystems through environmental management \* exists and is harmonized and integrated with the NPAP and adapted to the environmental and social needs of ILs.

\*this Plan would be aligned with and form part of a National Policy on Environmental Management of IL (PNGATI)

Analysis: the indicator is correct.

<u>6. Resources from existing biodiversity conservation sources used to achieve basic</u> operating standards for environmental management in ILs

#### Target:

At least 5 of the Reference ILs will receive at least 50% of the costs of basic operations\* from new funding mechanisms that include resources currently only available for biodiversity conservation in Pas for environmental services.

\*The project will work to determine costs of meeting basic operational standards and will test different funding mechanisms.

#### Analysis: the indicator is correct.

7. Staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio, FUNAI, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) aligned to implement and follow specific norms and regulations for ethnomanagement and ethno-zoning in ILs.

#### Target:

1- At least 20% increase in the number of MMA and FUNAI staff trained to implement and use such norms

2- At least 1 staff member in the OEMAs of the states of SC, MS, BA, PE, AM, PA, AC and RO trained to monitor these norms and regulations

3- IBAMA and ICMBio

4- Competency profiles for MMA/SF and FUNAI have been adjusted to include IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively.

Analysis: The indicator is multiple, with four distinct targets, making it difficult to verify whether they were achieved.

#### 8. Regulations adopted for environmental management in ILs including regulations on:

- 1. ethno zoning in ILs
- 2. land-use in areas surrounding ILs
- 3. management of overlapping IL and UCs
- 4. sustainable use of forest resources of IL

Target

- 1. At least 3 categories of ethno-zoning recognized for: conservation, sustainable use and restoration.
- 2. At least 1 regulation regarding land use in the areas surrounding ILs, e.g., creation of IL buffer zones.
- 3. Norms on homologizing management plans and ethno-plans of IL and UC.
- 4. Agreed-upon standards and limits for use of forest resources

#### Analysis:

- 1 the indicator is correct.
- 2 the indicator is correct.

3 - Inappropriate indicator: The text assumes that there is only one way to draw up management plans and management tools, which would be necessary for approval. The diversity of contexts and cultures of indigenous peoples necessarily points to a variety of formats and contents of plans.

4 - the indicator is correct.

<u>9. Existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of ethno zoning and plans</u>

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

Target:

- 1. All the IL reference areas have established surveillance Protocols and undertaken environmental monitoring
- 2. 50% of the ILs composing the network have established Surveillance Protocols and are developing environmental monitoring systems

#### Analysis: the indicator is correct.

#### OUTCOME 2:

A network of ILs modelling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by indigenous peoples and organizations

#### 10. Number of ethno-management plans in ILs that are:

- 1- developed and tested
- 2- have defined conservation goals
- 3- are officially recognized as meeting established norms for conservation by environmental and indigenous agencies in each region

Target:

- 1- 10 tested ethno-management plans with defined sustainable use, conservation practices, zones and goals relevant for each of the four forest biomes
- 2- 30 more ILs developing ethno management plans
- 3- All plans in reference areas are officially recognized as meeting norms by environmental agencies in each region

#### Analysis: all three targets are ok.

11. Degree of replication of experiences from Reference Areas to other ILs that improve management effectiveness as measured by increase in the METT scores of a sample of 23 ILS

Target:

- All Poor and Fair have reached at least Good Scores.
- All Good have reached Excellent Scores.
- All Excellent have remained Excellent.

#### Analysis:

Inconclusive indicator due to the inadequacy of the METT tool. Please see indicator 3.

#### 12. % of indigenous curricula that include information on BD & environmental management

- IP schools in network.
- IP schools nationwide.
- IP training centers (CFI).

#### Target:

- 50% of IP schools in network.
- 10% IP schools across country .
- 100% of 5 CFI.

Analysis:

• ok
- Inconclusive. There is no centralized information about the curricula of all indigenous schools in the country. The feasibility of obtaining this information should have been checked when preparing the indicator.
- ok

## OUTCOME 3

Sustainable and replicable models of forest management, based on ethno-management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes

### 13. Reduction in unsustainable extractive practices in the RAs

## Target:

100% reduction in the Caatinga, Cerrado, Atlantic forest and in the Amazon biome.

## Analysis:

Difficult to measure indicator due to lack of quantitative initial data on unsustainable practices, without which it is not possible to determine a percentage. Also, many of the information cannot be collected, because some pactices are prohibited by law (for example, native palm heart cut) and it was not possible for the project to obtain quantitative information about them.

## <u>14. Increase in the % of IP diet derived from the new agro-ecological production systems in IL Reference Areas in the Caatinga, Cerrado and Atlantic Forest</u>

## Target:

Communities inside ILs subsist on production derived from agro-ecological production within the zones delimited for this use.

Analysis: The indicator is not feasible as it is not possible to measure the diet of all the inhabitants of the 32 indigenous lands. Increase in agroecological production does not necessarily mean that 100% of the diet is based on this type of production, as food trade is a common practice of Indigenous People.

15. Increase in the income derived from the trade of NTFPs, including:

- Honey (melipona)
- Fruit: Cashew, açaí, baru
- Handicraft: liana, croá

## Target

- ILs in Cerrado, Caatinga, and Atlantic Forest with at least one income-generating agro-ecological activity.
- In the Amazon, 3 of the 4 RAs with trading activities implemented.

Analysis: The indicator would require close monitoring of the sources of income of families in target indigenous lands. The indicator is also not feasible as it is impossible to measure due the absense of a monitoring activity for the incomes of the indigenous families involved along time.

<u>16. Area of fragmented forest restored in IL of Atlantic forest with native species to improve connectivity</u>

## Target:

At least 40% of the fragmented areas that are critical to connectivity are in the process of restoration with native species.

## Analysis:

The indicator has proven to be difficult to measure without satellite monitoring of the changes in recovered areas. In several areas, the cultivation of agroforestry species takes place in small spaces or in clearings along the forest. There was no measurement of recovered areas areas cultivated were not measured and well defined. However, there is evidence of forest and spring recovery through plantations in several ILs of the Project.

The evaluation mission, after conducting an analysis of the objective- and outcome-level indicators, concluded that many of them were difficult to use to measure Project progress. In general, the problems of the indicators are related to the lack of objectivity, to their complexity, and little feasibility for effective measurement. There is also an excess of indicators for each outcome, which makes it difficult to measure if the Project fully accomplished them.

## Therefore the project M&E Design at Entry was considered Moderately Unsatisfactory (3).

## 3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The assumptions and risks were mainly related to the commitment of the Brazilian Government and the Indigenous Peoples to continue mobilized and participating as equal partners to secure conservation in ILs. These were rated as "Middle/Low". The risk that climate change would undermine Biodiversity values in ILs was rated "Low". The risks included in the ProDoc are presented in the following table:

Risk	Rating	Mitigation strategy
Government remains committed to working as an equal partner with IPs to secure conser- vation in ILs	M/L	Federal legislation on IPs' rights and environmental protection establish a strong incentive for the GoB to implement the project in partnership with IPs. Further, the project was conceived due to the demands of IP organizations to the GoB for integrated support to ILs. In June 2007, the GoB created the National Council for Indigenous Policy, the first time a Government Council included indigenous representatives. Project implementation arrangements will ensure the creation of a Managing Committee with equal representation from government and IPs.
IPs continue participating in conservation in ILs presenting a unified & coherent voice	M/L	The project was initiated by IPs. There is a high level of interest on their part to monitor, control, and preserve their territories so that their future generations have a suitable environment in which to live and undertake their traditions. There has been extensive consultation among IPs on this project and their support as illustrated in the letter to the GEF CEO at the CBD CoP 8 in 2006.
Climate change does not undermine BD values in ILS	L	CC is likely to affect forest ecosystems over time, however, this project will increase forest resilience in the long term by triggering change that consolidates ILs as PAs keeping anthropic stresses low in ILs; increasing the area of forest habitats under conservation and by increasing connectivity across landscapes within ILs and between these and other nearby PAs.

## Risks and risk management measures to be undertaken

The main risks were identified at the project design stage and the stated assumptions and risks were logical. The risk ratings were appropriate.

## 3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects

Project BRA/09/G32 benefited from lessons learned and from exchanges with other projects that were underway or already implemented by FUNAI and the partner institutions, non-governmental organizations and UNDP, the implementing agency.

The Projects mentioned in the ProDoc that provided inputs and lessons to the GATI Project, included the following:

- The "Integrated Project for the Protection of Indigenous Populations and Lands of the Legal Amazon" (PPTAL) implemented by FUNAI (with the support of KfW / World Bank / GTZ), which supported the participatory demarcation of 106 ILs as well as innovative experiences under the Surveillance Projects of Indigenous Peoples and the Ethno-ecological Survey tool.
- The "Indigenous Peoples' Demonstration Projects" (PDPI) executed by the MMA (support of KfW/ DIFID / GTZ) have also been a source of lessons and inputs, especially concerning the design and monitoring of small indigenous projects.
- "Promoting Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Forests of Northeast Mato Grosso" (GEF), which provided inputs for the network experiences implemented by the GATI Project with the incorporation of lessons from their experience in the processes of production and marketing of Brazil Nut in outcome 2 of the GATI Project.
- "Support to Public Policy for Sustainable Development", implemented by MMA, is a
  project that has provided support to the GATI Project, since it involves ILs in
  strengthening the mechanisms of ecological-economic zoning. Indigenous
  representatives participating in this Project have contributed to the network of
  experiences of the GATI Project and these inputs also appear as part of the cofinancing of the partnership granted by MMA to the Project.
- Another project providing support to the exchange of experience, outcome 2 of the GATI Project, is the "Project for Food and Nutrition Security of Children and Women", approved by the the Millennium Development Goal Fund (FMDM), funded by Spain.

Similarly, one can mention the projects executed by the NGO The Nature Conservancy (TNC), a partner in the Project, which provided inputs in terms of experiences and lessons from projects such as "Project for Indigenous Landscapes (PIB)," which aimed to strengthen indigenous organizations in their strategic areas, generating inputs arising from experiences with environmental management in two ILs in Amapá and Roraima. This Project was led by TNC in partnership with the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB), the International Institute for Education in Brazil (IEB), the Institute for Indigenous Research and Training (Iepé), and the Indigenous Council of Roraima (CIR). This project also supported the participation of indigenous peoples in discussions for the construction of the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management (PNGATI). The institution is also a partner of the GATI Project, from the discussions for drafting the PNGATI to its execution, and worked in areas of the Eastern Amazon based on the Letter of Agreement signed in July 2014.

Another project with GEF financing is the "Program for Small Ecosocial Projects (PPP-ECOS)" implemented by the NGO Institute for Society, Population and Nature (ISPN), which provided inputs and lessons from successful experiences for the GATI Project. These inputs

and lessons result from the support of the Program to the sustainable use of biodiversity as a conservation strategy. The PPP-ECOS has been dedicated to supporting conservation initiatives geared towards sustainable livelihoods in the biome, i.e., forms of production and income generation able to reconcile environmental conservation and social welfare. The indigenous population has also been the beneficiary of many projects supported by the Program. Based on these experiences, the GATI Project signed a Letter of Agreement with the ISPN for the implementation and monitoring of micro and small projects as of 2014.

Similarly, projects developed by the Project's partners, such as ICMBio / MMA provided support as a result of their experience in monitoring biological indicators of biodiversity for the conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity, a goal of the GATI Project and its outcomes.

In sum, all key projects, relevant initiatives and lessons learned were identified at the project design stage and mentioned in the ProDoc. These lessons learned were fundamental to the successful implementation of the project.

## 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

Indigenous peoples were key actors in the Project and leading actors for environmental management in ILs. The very Project proposal was motivated by the request of the indigenous movement and is based on extensive participation and consultation with indigenous peoples and their organizations. Annex 3 of the ProDoc and the volume systematizing results in the theme "Indigenous Participation and Leadership", prepared by the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (APIB), show this participation, both in the preparation phase, involving five regional consultations, and during implementation.

The main indigenous organizations representing sub-regions / in the biome of the Project were:

- Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB): North / Amazon;
- Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the *Pantanal* and its Region (ARPINPAN): Mid-West / *Pantanal*;
- Coordination of Mato Grosso: Mid-West / Cerrado;
- Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Northeast, Minas Gerais and Espirito Santo (APOINME): Brazil / *Caatinga* and Atlantic Forest Northeast ;
- Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the South (ARPIN-Sul): South / Atlantic Forest.

Organizations, such as the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (APIB), were part of the Project Steering Committee, contributing to the evaluations of activities and decisions to be taken regarding the Annual Operating Plans (POAs), programming the allocation of resources and activities of the Project. In addition to the six indigenous representatives, the Steering Committee has three representatives of FUNAI and 3 representatives of the MMA. UNDP and TNC participate as observers.

The stakeholders of the Project included, in addition to indigenous organizations, local indigenous leaders, indigenous communities, local managers of ICMBio, universities, research and extension institutions, NGOs and other civil society organizations (TNC, CI, ISPN, IEB, Iepé).

In sum, the ProDoc appropriately planned for the participation of all stakeholders mentioned. Some of the stakeholders, as ISPN and IEB, even increased their participation during the implementation of the project, in order to counterbalance the diminishing execution capacity of FUNAI (see 3.2.1 Adaptive management and 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements).

## 3.1.5 Replication approach

According to the ProDoc, "to support replication, the project strategy included efforts to address barriers at systemic level (policies, financing, institutions, capacities) that inhibit ILs from realizing their full potential as contributors to biodiversity conservation. By strengthening this enabling environment the project lays the ground for further replication post-project. Furthermore, replication of successful experiences in promoting ethno-environmental management in ILs will be supported through the project's regional and national networks for exchange of experiences among the 32 RAs identified per biome (Output 2.2).

Replication was planned in two ways:

Knowledge management and dissemination: The project was designed to produce various methodological and technical tools in the form of user-friendly guides and manuals tailored to the cultural preferences of IPs, some of them in native languages. Dissemination was promoted through the regional and national networks (Output 2.2). As the Project expanded the original number of RAs from 10 to 32, it promoted a significant number of experience exchange workshops engaging all the biomes. The objective was to have effective exchange of knowledge about ethnomanagement mechanisms that can be easily replicated in other ILs. Therefore, methodological tools were tailored to the needs and capacities of each biome. The project accomplished what was expected and described in ProDoc, Some specific technical publications addressed to indigenous people and the general public were published and distributed.

The ProDoc also mentioned a "Replication Strategy and Budget" that should be prepared by MMA and FUNAI before the project's end. This strategy should specify additional ILs where the project's approach would be applied. As the number of RAs expanded from 10 to 32 at the beginning of the project, this replication strategy can be considered completely fulfilled.

Besides the approach defined at the project design, two other actions were carried on, in order to insure replication:

Before project end, a lot of the experience and knowledge built by the Project was systematized in publications. These books present all the important aspects of each biome and each indigenous land experience with the Project. Besides this collection of publications oriented according to the five regions, the Project also published a thematic collection of experiences, organized as follows: territorial and environmental management tools; territorial and environmental management training; agroecology, agroforestry and environment recuperation; indigenous protagonism and participation; and project management. These publications summarize the knowledge generated by the Project, laying the groundwork for future replication.

Finally, a Replication budget through the PNGATI was included in the Pluri Annual Plan of FUNAI (2016-2020) and the Implementation Plan of PNGATI which brought together a number of governmental agencies such as MMA, IBAMA, SESAI and FUNAI and organize their responsibilities related to future actions in ILs related to environment and territorial protection.

## 3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

The project focused on establishing the governance framework and capacities for indigenous- based forest protection through a PA approach. UNDP has extensive experience both in Brazil and world-wide in PA policy and governance frameworks and in projects with indigenous people, as the Indigenous Peoples Fellowship Initiative of GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP).

The Brazilian UNDP Country Office has been working with public institutions engaged with indigenous issues, as the Ministry of Health, in projects related to indigenous nutrition (Carteira indígena), the indigenous health public system (Vigisus I and II), indigenous ethnodevelopment (Carteira Indígena and PDPI),

Furthermore, UNDP IP policy indicates that engagement with indigenous peoples is grounded in UNDP mandated areas of work. The project objective was in line with the UNDP Country Programme goals for Brazil that include promoting greater participation of, and dialogue between, resource users and civil society in policies related to environmental resource management; and improved capacity of community-based groups in sustainable environmental management.

The evaluation mission identified the benefits generated by the close collaboration between the Brazilian UNDP Country Office and the Project team. The UNDP CO supported a number of project initiatives (micro and small projects), using the letter of agreements (an UNDP tool to facilitate hiring services). These initiatives were responsible for innovative experiences in ethno-environmental management. These initiatives contributed for the results achieved by the Project (see 3.2.1 Adaptive management and 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements).

## 3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

According the ProDoc, the project would benefit from lessons learned and exchange of experiences of a number of projects in UNDP Brazil that promote environmental sustainability and poverty alleviation by developing local communities` capacities for the sustainable use of natural resources. The target beneficiaries of key projects are indigenous communities and traditional populations that depend on the environment for their livelihoods. These initiatives demonstrate environmentally sound alternatives to development, generating income and improving the quality of life of local populations. The following ongoing projects of UNDP/Brazil portfolio (at the time of Project Formulation) would be of particular relevance:

*"Promoting Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in the Frontier Forests of Northwest Mato Grosso:* This GEF funded project balances socio-economic development in this part of the Amazon region with biodiversity conservation, working with small farmers, traditional and indigenous populations and loggers. It has consolidated a mosaic of protected areas and ecological corridors by promoting alternatives for the use and commercialization of non-timber forest products. The ILs participating in this project provided inputs into the network of experiences being proposed in this current project, particularly through their experience with the brazil nut production process and commercialization.

Food and Nutrition Security of Indigenous Children and Women in Brazil: This project was recently approved by the Millennium Development Goals Fund (MDG-F), financed by Spain, and aims at contributing to the food and nutritional security of vulnerable indigenous children and women in the regions of Dourados – Mato Grosso do Sul, and Alto Rio Solimões (Higher Solimões River) – Amazonas, Brazil. The project strategy involves implementing actions to support the qualification and integration of public policies, especially in the fields of health

and social development at local levels. A number of UN Agencies (UNICEF, FAO, ILO, PAHO/WHO, UNDP) are participating in this initiative together with FUNAI, MDS and local institutions."

*PNGATI Implementation*: The project PNUD BRA 13019 started in 2013 and received direct support from the GATI Project, which financed consultants and planning meetings for its elaboration. Both projects contributed to the design and implementation of the Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands National Policy . It is important to mention that the PNGATI implementation project was not mentioned in the documents of GATI Project because it was started later. However, due to their common theme and area, both projects worked in synergy.

Thus, this evaluation identified only the third UNDP Project as relevant in terms of linkages that were actually established. Despite the importance of the two first projects and their areas/themes, only the PNGATI Implementation Project worked in synergy with the GATI Project.

## 3.1.8 Management arrangements

There was a large number of different actors and institutions participating in the project, both for the execution of specific activities across the country and for the application of long-term policies and resulting management instruments. Thus, project implementation arrangements were designed to guide implementation through a coordinated structure. This consists of National and Regional Project Committees and Project Management Units as described below.

The implementation arrangement included staff designated by key institutions involved in environmental management in Indigenous Lands (MMA, FUNAI, and Indigenous organizations). It also included technical advisers (be they individual, NGOs or specialized institutions) hired when specialized knowledge was necessary, and local indigenous representatives hired in the selected Reference Areas. A Project Steering Committee was charged with ensuring overall coherence. These management arrangements were adequately described in the ProDoc, as detailed in the following paragraphs.

The project was executed under the NEX (National Execution) modality by Brazil's Ministry of the Environment (MMA), the National Indian Foundation (FUNAI) and by the following Indigenous Organizations: (1) Organization of the Indigenous Peoples of the South (ARPIN-SUL), (2) Organization of the Indigenous Peoples of the Pantanal and Region (ARPINPAN), (3) Organization of the Indigenous Peoples of the Northeast, Minas Gerais and Espírito Santo (APOINME) and (4) Coordination of the Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB).

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) was responsible for discussing and approving the project's Annual Operational Plans (AOPs), including the allocation of resources and the evaluation of activities undertaken and in progress. The PSC was composed of a council with six members of indigenous organizations (ARPIN-SUL, ARPINPAN, APOINME, and COIAB), three members of the MMA, and three members of FUNAI. UNDP will participate as an observer, given its fiduciary responsibilities with GEF. TNC participated as an observer. It was expected that the PSC would meet every six months, to review project planning; implementation processes and results, and to provide guidance for the execution of actions defined in the Project Document. The PSC would also determine and monitor adaptive measures necessary to address problems identified during project implementation and support the incorporation of experiences and lessons learnt during the project into national public policies.

The Project Management Unit (PMU) was responsible for the overall coordination of the project, including operational planning, supervision, administrative and financial management and the adaptive management of the project. The PMU was responsible for the supervision of day-to-day implementation of all the project activities in all of its components. The PMU was responsible for acting as the executive secretariat of the PSC, calling PSC meetings and participating in them as secretary. The responsibilities in charge of the PMU were: (1) managing and executing all of the project components; (2) coordinating financial resource management and acquisitions; (3) informing on the use of GEF resources and on results achieved; (4) preparing management reports for the PSC and UNDP; (5) promoting institutional coordination among all involved stakeholders including government and nongovernmental organizations participating in the project; and (6) monitoring, evaluating and disseminating the project results.

At the national level, the PMU was composed of a National Director, a National Coordinator, a National Technical Coordinator, a Financial Coordinator and two Project Administrative Assistants. As the Project is partly financed by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), oversight of the activities necessary for the achievement of project objectives was carried out by specialists hired directly by UNDP and exclusively linked to this project. The following two paragraphs summarize the main activities of the PMU members. The PMU also had regional components – or Regional Centers that provided close support to the activities undertaken in the Reference Areas.

At the regional level the project implementation structure consisted of Regional Councils (RCONs), which were composed of representatives from regional indigenous organizations, MMA and FUNAI, reflecting the regional composition of the indigenous peoples. Representatives of relevant local organizations and programmes were invited as observers as needed and especially during the period of annual planning. The RCONs main role would be to provide guidance on project implementation, ensuring it is in line with regional polices; provide recommendations to the PSC on potential changes in the project; and review the regional operation work plans providing recommendations as needed for change. The RCONs would meet every four months, in order to monitor project activities in that region and to analyze the implementation processes and outcomes, thus guiding the execution of actions in the Regional Centers. The RCONs would also identify and monitor the necessary adaptive measures to correct problems identified in the project intervention areas and support the incorporation of experiences and lessons learnt in these areas during the project.

The actual role and importance of the RCONs was not well defined. Some Regional Councils had 3 or 4 meetings and others just one meeting. This evaluation mission considered that the RCONs did not accomplish the responsibilities expected of them. It seems that the lack of meetings did not lead to problems for the implementation of the project, although the councils could have been useful to solve local/regional issues or challenges.

Despite the insufficient involvement of the Regional Councils, this evaluation considers the management arrangements as satisfactory, as the main results were achieved. During the Project cycle this arrangement proved to be adequate as it provided the flexibility necessary to undertake the majority of planned activities.

## 3.2 **Project Implementation**

## 3.2.1 Adaptive management

Adaptive management can be regarded as an organized process of changes in Project design and project outputs during its implementation to respond to challenges and to overcome difficulties arising from changing contexts.

The Project had its operational start in 2010 with the establishment of its Steering Committee. Subsequently, consultations were held with indigenous peoples to obtain their agreement to participate in the Project. After the consultations, the number of reference ILs increased from 12 to 32. The initial proposal included 12 ILs as *reference areas* (RAs) and another 20 ILs as a *network of experiences*, which would benefit from activities already tested in the reference areas. Equal treatment for the full range of indigenous lands generated impacts and required adjustments from management.

Despite the increase in the number of reference areas, the immediate goal and the outcomes expected from the Project were not modified. However, the demand for execution of activities increased significantly. Adaptive management was not used to modify and adjust the outcomes but in the means employed to carry out the activities, which will be described below.

To adapt to the larger number of reference areas, the Project relied on significant support from local partnerships (indigenous associations, Regional Offices of FUNAI, NGOs, universities, and regional indigenous organizations).

However, the dependency on the use of the institutional and regionalized structure of FUNAI represented a risk of delays and restrictions on Project implementation due to limited implementation capacity and to bureaucracy related to procurement of goods and contracting. These limitations were resolved with the use of other mechanisms to make activities more agile and to expedite them. Thus, the GATI Project used five strategies to increase its capacity of action:

- Letters of agreement with partner institutions. The letters of agreement are a type of instrument used by UNDP that allows the transfer of Project resources directly to legal entities (private organizations, civil society). The instrument allowed relevant organizations and partners to be hired directly to conduct national and local activities (such as publications).
- Micro-projects. This is a simple way to fund projects (via UNDP) worth up to USD 1,300, directly to an individual. Thus, indigenous individuals were able to have access to the resources necessary for carrying out activities in the villages, with different objectives: planting seedlings, small livestock-raising activities, meetings and courses.
- The Project also made use of an existing mechanism in UNDP, called Small Contracts, made to individuals in the amount of up to USD 2,500.00. Through this instrument, adhoc services were performed, mainly related to publications.
- New funding sources were organized to support the activities: the Ministry of Environment, through the Climate Fund and BNDES, with the Amazon Fund. One should highlight the publication of a call for proposals by the Climate Fund to support the development of Plans for Territorial and Environmental Management in Indigenous Lands in the Cerrado and Caatinga, regions which are generally excluded from the usual funding sources.
- Small Collaborative Projects. The letter of agreement with the NGO ISPN allowed for community projects with direct funding provided to indigenous associations in the

themes included in the GATI Project, with values up to USD 13,000. The Small Projects were responsible for various activities such as reforestation, recovery of degraded areas, sustainable productive activities, and preparation of Territorial and Environmental Management Plans.

Another adaptive measure to ensure project execution was shown in the Substantive Revision, which extended the Project closing date to October 2016.

## 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements

Partnership arrangements were very important for the successful implementation of the Project. According to the 2016 PIR, in addition to the stakeholders mentioned above (3.1.4), the project successfully established diverse local and regional partnerships, principally through the mechanism of **Letters of Agreement**, which greatly improved project effectiveness and scope. Through one of these partnerships, with ISPN, the project was able to support 37 small projects for indigenous associations, of approximately USD 12,000 each.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC): through a Letter of Agreement, carried out a number of activities in the Oiapoque, Wajãpi and Trincheira-Bacajá Indigenous Lands: a value chain study of the fruits of the açaí-palm - *Euterpe oleracea* (Oiapoque), and ethnomapping and preparation of a management plan (Trincheira-Bacajá). TNC also leveraged an additional USD 5.3 million from the Amazon Fund/BNDES to carry out activities in these indigenous lands.

The indigenous organization ASCURI was hired by means of a Letter of Agreement to carry out the itinerant training program *Mosarambihara* (Seeders) designed by project consultants for the Guarani-Kaiowá of three reference areas in Mato Grosso do Sul. Each module of the program worked on a specific topic, according to local interests: agroecology, forest restoration, forest tree seeds and extractivism of erva mate (*llex paraguayensis*) and this also included ethnomapping and video workshops.

The Instituto Sociedade, População e Natureza (ISPN) was hired by means of a Letter of Agreement to assist the project in carrying out a small grants program for indigenous organizations in project reference areas. A total of 35 projects were implemented in 22 ILs. ISPN brought their experience of 20 years with UNDP GEF's Small Grants Program.

Through another Letter of Agreement with the Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil (IEB), the Project held the National Seminar on Indigenous Training for Territorial and Environmental Management, with the participation of more than 50 indigenous representatives and partners from different regions, and more than 40 government employees as well as NGO and international cooperation partners. IEB was also responsible for the organization of the Project closing seminar and the systematization of GATI experiences, which resulted in the publication of five thematic reports.

Through a letter of agreement with the Comissão Pró-Índio do Acre (CPI-AC), the existing management plan of the Mamoadate Indigenous Land was revised and updated. CPI-AC is now preparing a publication.

In short, all key partners were engaged in the project and some could even increase their engagement during project implementation, as mentioned above.

## 3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

## Application of the METT Tool

Projects implemented with GEF funds aimed at biodiversity conservation and protected areas typically use the WWF/World Bank *Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool* as a monitoring tool. The GATI Project also used the METT, to establish the Project baseline and monitor impact. A version of the tool adapted to the context of ILs was used during Project preparation in 2008 and the results are included in an Annex to the English version of the ProDoc, in the form of scores for 30 ILs.

The second application of the tool occurred in 2011 to set up the Project baseline (Project Implementation Report, 2008). A large discrepancy in the data was found (source: Management Report, Inputs for the request of Project extension, FUNAI, 2014). The analysis of results and comparison with the first use showed that in 2008 there was:

"...evident shortage and superficiality of information about the existence of illegal or harmful activities to the environment. This was partly because, in 2008, the METT was filled out by five consultants hired by the UNDP to support the preparation of the Project proposal to be submitted to GEF, each being responsible for a region, but not necessarily having in-depth knowledge about the ILs that were indicated as Reference Areas. The METT was filled out based largely on interviews with indigenous movement leaders or representatives. Due to lack of familiarity with the tool and its objectives, a number of socio-environmental problems in the reference areas were underestimated "(Kinzo, M. and Berraondo, M. - Midterm Review Report. Bra 09 / G32, 2014. p.71)

On that occasion, the METT proved not to be an appropriate tool for measuring the environmental management impact on the conservation of biological diversity of the Indigenous Lands covered by the Project. The fact that the tool was developed to be used in Conservation Units, where there is the figure of a manager who centralizes the environmental information showed its inadequacy when used in an Indigenous Land, whose environmental information is not organized and not centralized through an individual, generating great variability of responses according to the interviews.

The Project developed an adaptation of the METT to describe the socio-environmental situation of reference areas, and used it in 2013. Regional consultants themselves applied the adapted tool. The result of using the adapted METT specific to indigenous lands was a clearer picture of the situation in the areas, but it cannot be compared to previous applications of the tool, which meant that it could not be used for monitoring project impact.

This inadequate monitoring instrument prevented the measurement of indicator 3 (Outcome 1) of the Project: "Increased effectiveness in the management of ILs that serve as Reference Areas".

## METT scores 2008 and 2013

(Source: Midterm Review Report, 2014)

	INDIGENOUS LAND	AR	METT 2008	METT 2013	Difference	Logical Change <sup>15</sup>
1	Pirakuá	AR	70	45	-25	NEGATIVE
2	Lalima	AR	72	45	-27	NEGATIVE
3	Cachoeirinha		70	52	-18	NEGATIVE
4	Jaguapiré		66	42	-24	NEGATIVE
5	Sassoró		65	37	-28	NEGATIVE
6	Taunay		70	43	-27	NEGATIVE
7	Xerente		0	40	40	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
8	Pankararu-Entre Serras	AR	38	27	-11	NEGATIVE
9	Caramuru-Paraguaçu	AR	30	24	-6	NEGATIVE
10	Kiriri		39	32	-7	NEGATIVE
11	Potiguara		36	39	3	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
12	Xacriabá		33	35	2	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
13	Caieiras Velhas II		35	36	1	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
14	Caiçara-Ilha de São Pedro		34	33	-1	NEGATIVE
15	Córrego João Pereira		31	31	0	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
16	Xokleng de Ibirama	AR	56	23	-33	NEGATIVE
17	Mangueirinha		56	31	-25	NEGATIVE
18	Ribeirão Silveira	AR	56	60	4	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
19	Bracui	AR	62	48	-14	NEGATIVE
20	Avá-Guarani de Oco'y		56	31	-25	NEGATIVE
21	Araribá		0	46	46	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
22	Tenondé		0	53	53	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
23	Mamoadate	AR	56	56	0	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
24	Igarapé Lourdes	AR	60	58	-2	NEGATIVE
25	Andirá-Marau	AR	68	54	-14	NEGATIVE
26	Trincheira Bacajá		52	54	2	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
27	Wajãpi		61	76	15	POSITIVE/NEUTRAL
28	Xamboiá		45	43	-2	NEGATIVE
29	Bakairi		55	39	-16	NEGATIVE
30	Jumina		57	54	-3	NEGATIVE
31	Galibi		57	54	-3	NEGATIVE
32	Uaçá		57	54	-3	NEGATIVE

The issue of the drop in scores was discussed in the 2014 PIR (Indicator 3: Level at 30 June 2014), which we cite below:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> - The Logical change is the tendency identified by the different values throughout the years.

"The METT scores for 2008 and 2013, as well as the alternative instrument, were evaluated by a consultant contracted by TNC, who found significant volatility in the results when comparisons are made across biomes, with scores for Caatinga/Mata Atlântica Nordeste increasing for no apparent reason. This volatility also raises doubts as to the veracity of the original METT application. As a yardstick for comparing this problem of volatility in METT scores, the data for deforestation rates in the reference areas paints an entirely different picture, with the majority of reference areas showing a decrease in area deforested between 2008 and 2013."

In short, we can say that the experience gained by the GATI project - the GEF's first initiative entirely directed towards indigenous lands - shows that **the METT is an inadequate and inappropriate instrument for measuring management effectiveness in indigenous lands**. If the GEF is to fund other indigenous projects, we suggest that other instruments be applied, such as, for example, the instrument developed by The Nature Conservancy in partnership with the GATI project. This instrument was applied in seven of the project's reference areas, and besides showing a greater robustness, had a good acceptance by the communities involved. Unfortunately, this instrument was developed towards the end of the project, so it could not be reapplied in order to evaluate its capacity to detect change.

## Mid Term Review

The Evaluation Mission didn't identify any contributions of the Mid-Term Review report to the adaptative management related to the project indicators. The recommendations of the Mid Term Review can be organized in two different groups:

- The first group contains the recommendations related to the institutional strengthening of the institutions responsible for the Project and the partners, as well indigenous organizations and the Project team. The needs for increasing the capacities of the organizations engaged with the Project were several: capacity building for public policies for indigenous people, better structure for indigenous organizations, improvements of the communication between the institutions, better qualification of FUNAI public servants.
- The second group of recommendations was more objective: to improve and expand the micro-projects as a tool for achieve the expected results, to build a project communication plan in order to improve the project benefits and initiatives disclosure.

## 3.2.4 Project Finance

Tables A and B with the project budget specifications and Table C with the total budget of FUNAI departments involved with the Project are presented below:

## Table A: GEF and co-financing (cash and in-kind) 2010-2016 (USD)

Annual Executi	ion by Instit	ution (US	D)																				
	6			-	Exacuted									% of Commitment									
Institution	Commith	nent at Endor	rsement	201	.0	201	11	20	12	201	13	20	14	201	.5	20:	16		Total			Executed	
	cash	in kind	Total	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	cash	in kind	Cash+In kind	% cash	% in kind	% total
GEF	6.000.000	-	6.000.000	39.403	-	112.369	-	553.495	-	1.118.735	-	1.428.126	-	1.425.427	-	1.084.629	-	5.762.185	-	5.762.185	96%		96%
FUNAI	18.000.000	2.000.000	20.000.000	1.103.788	133.362	441.004	174.482	532.547	471.041	1.105.361	454.000	2.297.339	555.386	922.057	498.514	456.886	378.709	6.858.983	2.665.494	9.524.477	38%	133%	48%
MMA	4.940.000	1.625.113	6.565.113	493.394	-	1.342.682	136.344	-	-	-	11.700	1.294.813	56.653	749.577	34.440	3.819.939	-	7.700.406	239.137	7.939.543	156%	15%	121%
TNC	2.100.000	1.374.565	3.474.565	784.420	417.668	554.303	505.804	201.840	460.826	143.832	445.106	386.891	426.131	-	-	-	-	2.071.286	2.255.534	4.326.820	99%	164%	125%
APOINME	-	302.787	302.787	-	15.943	-	45.894	-	77.331	-	70.465	-	66.873	-	45.834	-	35.299	-	357.639	357.639		118%	118%
PNUD	400.000	-	400.000	-	-	202.281	-	197.719	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400.000	-	400.000	100%		100%
Total co-financing	25.440.000	5.302.465	30.742.465	2.381.603	566.973	2.540.271	862.524	932.106	1.009.198	1.249.193	981.271	3.979.044	1.105.043	1.671.634	578.788	4.276.825	414.008	17.030.675	5.517.804	22.548.479	67%	104%	73%
TOTAL	31.440.000	5.302.465	36.742.465	2.421.005	566.973	2.652.640	862.524	1.485.602	1.009.198	2.367.928	981.271	5.407.170	1.105.043	3.097.061	578.788	5.361.454	414.008	22.792.861	5.517.804	28.310.664	72%	104%	77%

Execution by 25/11/2016

#### Annual Execution in Real (BRL) considering the average annual exchange rate USD/BRL

Average annual ex. rate USD/BRL (2009-2016)	1,73	1,77	1,67	1,95	2,14	2,32	3,29	3,25	Total in BRL	% of Total Executed in BRL
TOTAL in Real (BRL)	63.564.464	5.288.721	5.870.324	4.864.859	7.167.286	15.108.333	12.093.543	18.770.252	69.163.319	109%

## Table B: GEF Budget Execution by Result (USD)

			EXI	ECUTION / Y		TOTAL	BUDGET AS				
RESULI	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016 (*)	BY RESULT	ProDoc (*)	% EXECUTED	
R1	126	21.761	25.973	142.682	171.426	351.617	186.213	899.799	906.780	99%	
R2	-	446	457.607	683.654	696.637	440.454	253.589	2.532398	2.582.904	98%	
R3	-	-	5.766	181.593	342.923	621.367	612.476	1.764.125	1.910.316	92%	
R4	39.276	90.163	64.149	110.806	217.140	11.989	32.351	565.864	600.000	94%	
Total	Total         39.403         112.369         553.495         1.118.735         1.429.157         1.425.427         1.084.629         5.762.185         6.000.000         96%										
Notes (*): exec	Notes (*): execution till 25/11/2016; ProDoc budget with resource reallocation adjustment (USD 590.000 from R1 to R2)										

## Table C: Decline of FUNAI's budget 2010-2016 (BRL) (This table includes only the FUNAI departments involved with the Project)

	2010		2011		20	2012		2013		2014		15	20	16
Department	Inicial Budget	Final Budget												
CGETNO	15.350.000,00	13.350.000,00	13.176.000,00	12.176.000,00	13.076.000,00	10.276.000,00	12.154.799,00	12.154.799,00	11.561.293,00	11.561.293,00	11.549.747,00	11.549.747,00	7.067.487,00	7.084.464,00
CGGAM *					5.985.839,00	5.485.839,00	5.559.560,00	5.559.560,00	5.238.063,00	5.238.063,00	5.210.964,00	5.210.964,00	3.171.462,00	3.171.462,00
CGMT *					8.745.399,00	10.445.399,00	8.112.600,00	9.812.600,00	6.779.344,00	8.779.344,00	6.765.037,00	8.745.037,00	4.238.516,00	6.758.516,00
CGGAM incl. CGMT *	18.600.000,00	17.600.000,00	18.042.206,00	16.842.206,00										
TOTAL (BRL)	33.950.000,00	30.950.000,00	31.218.206,00	29.018.206,00	27.807.238,00	26.207.238,00	25.826.959,00	27.526.959,00	23.578.700,00	25.578.700,00	23.525.748,00	25.505.748,00	14.477.465,00	17.014.442,00
Decrease compared to 20	10	0		-6,24 %		-15,32 %		-11,06 %		-17,35 %		-17,59 %		-45,03 %

CGETNO: General Coordination for Promotion of Ethno-development; CGGAM: General Coordination of Environmental Management; CGMT: General Coordination of Territorial Monitoring.

\* In the 2012 restructuring of FUNAI, CGGAM and CGMT had their budgets separated

Source: FUNAI, 2017.

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Budget cut	Decreto nº 7.409 de 28/dez/10	Decreto nº 7.622 de 22/nov/11	Decreto nº 7.847 de 23/nov/12	Decreto nº 8.143 de 22/nov/13	Decreto nº 8.367 de 28/nov/14	Decreto nº 8.581 de 03/dez/15	Decreto nº 8.859 de 26/set/16
ordinances and decrees				Portaria nº 207/MPOG de 31/mai/13		Portaria nº 172/MPOG de 27/mai/15	Decreto nº 8.824 de 29/jul/16
orumanees and decrees							Portaria nº 611/MJC de 11/jun/16
							Portaria nº 067/MPOG de 01/mar/16

Source: http://www.orcamentofederal.gov.br/clientes/portalsof/portalsof/orcamentos-anuais/orcamento-2010/orcamentos\_anuais\_view?anoOrc=2010

Table A shows some peculiarities in the course of the Project.

First, it is worth noting there was a delay between Project approval (end of 2009) and establishment of the Project Management Unit (PMU) in 2011. The beginning of the Project was postponed because of consultations being carried out to prepare PNGATI's proposal, since the government institutions and indigenous organizations involved were basically the same. At the same time, in this interval, FUNAI went through two very impactful restructuring processes in 2010 and 2012. These facts explain the low delivery of GEF funds and the high implementation of co-financing from FUNAI and MMA, which paid for the consultations, as shown in Table A.

Three sectors of FUNAI had direct involvement in the Project actions: the General Coordination of Environmental Management (CGGAM), the General Coordination for Promotion of Ethno-development (CGETNO), both linked to the Division for Promotion of Sustainable Development (PDSD), and the General Coordination of Territorial Monitoring (CGMT), under the Board for Territorial Protection (DPT).

At the beginning of the Project, the CGGAM budget included territorial protection actions, currently attributed to CGMT / DPT, and the monitoring of licensing procedures of projects that affect Indigenous Lands, currently under the General Coordination of Environmental Licensing (CGLIC / DPDS). In the 2012 restructuring process, CGGAM and CGMT had their budgets separated, which can be seen in Table C.

Table C shows a reduction in the budget authorized by law to these three sectors (which goes for FUNAI as a whole). Thus, between 2010 and 2016 one can see a decrease of 45% in the budget of these sectors, in addition to the annual cuts, enacted by the legislative acts listed in the same table. These cuts hampered the provision of FUNAI's co-financing to the Project. At the same time, the appreciation of the USD against the Real brought additional difficulties for FUNAI to reach the values initially committed as co-financing. It is important to note that the budgets of the three sectors directly involved with the Project, CGGAM, CGETNO and CGMT, are expected to cover all indigenous lands in Brazil, not only the 32 listed as reference areas of the Project.

It is worth noting that even with the reduced cash counterpart from FUNAI (38%), total execution of the planned amount (cash + in kind) reached 77%. This is due in part to the increased cash co-financing from MMA, due to the leverage under the Climate Fund, and increased in-kind co-financing from FUNAI and TNC.

The non-financial contribution of FUNAI was of utmost importance to ensure the full functioning of the PMU, which included four CGGAM staff. Only the Technical Coordinator of the Project and one financial consultant were hired by UNDP. The permanence, for the most part, of the same team in the PMU ensured work fluidity and knowledge generation for a team with no technical background in International Cooperation Projects.

Thus, through strong coordination among the PMU, the FUNAI General Coordination, the FUNAI Regional Coordination Offices involved, regional consultants, indigenous representatives, MMA, TNC and UNDP, the Project managed to execute in BRL - considering the appreciation of the USD - 109% of the initially planned amount, as shown in Table A.

The financial management by the executing agency and by the implementing agency can be considered as adequate.

## Leveraged resources

Since the Project had as its greatest result the development and enactment of the PNGATI, significant leveraging of resourceswas achieved, mainly to support the Plans for the Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PGTAs). Thus, the GATI Project supported interinstitutional coordination and liaison which led, between 2013 and 2016, to different calls for proposals to support the design and implementation of PGTAs, totaling over **USD 31 million** dedicated to the theme:

- MMA / Indigenous Peoples' Demonstration Projects (IPDP): USD 1.6 million for PGTAs in the Amazon;
- Amazon Fund / BNDES: USD 28 million for PGTAs in the Amazon, privileging implementation of initiatives of PGTAs already drawn up;
- Climate Fund / MMA, via FUNAI / UNDP Project (BRA13/019) supporting PNGATI implementation: USD 1.2 million for development of PGTAs in the Cerrado and Caatinga;
- MMA / Department of Extractivism: R\$ 0.25 million for PGTAs in the state of Maranhão.

## 3.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry and implementation

## a) The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan: design, organization and adaptation.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is defined in the ProDoc and presented all activities related to M&E on daily, periodic, and annual bases. It also described the basic characteristics of regular reports to be prepared, either by PMU staff or by independent consultants.

This evaluation found that the M & E Plan was properly prepared with regard to the description of reporting procedures, contents and responsibilities. The information was complete, including the expected dates for each monitoring output. The provision of funds for financing of each action was sufficient for the tasks planned as shown in the following table:

Tipy of M&A activity	Responsible parts	Budget USD	Time frame
Inception Workshop I (IW)	<ul> <li>Project Coordinator</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	15.000	Whithin first two months of project start up
Inception Report	■ Project team ■ UNDP CO	1.000	Immediately following IW
Mesurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul> <li>Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsabilities to relevant team members.</li> </ul>	10.000	Start, mid and end of project

## Monitoring and Evaluation Work Plan and Corresponding Budget

Tipy of M&A activity	Responsible parts	Budget USD	Time frame
	<ul> <li>Oversight by Project GEF Technical Advisor and Project Coodinator</li> <li>Measurements by consultants, regional field officers and local IOs</li> </ul>	To be defined as part of the Annual Workplan. 50.000 (10.000/year)	Yearly prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
Conduct METT	PMO and local IOs	Included above	Mid-term and end
APR and PIR	<ul> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP-GEF</li> </ul>	15.000 for translating	Yearly
TPR and TPR report	<ul> <li>Government counterparts</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP-GEF Regional Coodinating Unit</li> </ul>	none	Every year, upon receipt of APR
Steering Committee Meetings and participation of IPs in M&E	<ul> <li>Project Coordinator</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> </ul>	82.500	Following Project IW and subsequently at least once a year
Periodic Status report	Project team	none	to be determined by Project team and UNDP CO
Technical reports	<ul> <li>Project team</li> <li>Hired consultants as needed</li> </ul>	none	to be determined by Project team and UNDP CO
Mid-Term External Evaluation (with travel costs)	<ul> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit</li> <li>External consultants (i.e evaluation team)</li> </ul>	US\$35.000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final External Evaluation (with travel costs)	<ul> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit</li> <li>External consultants (i.e evaluation team)</li> </ul>	45.000	At the endo of project implementation.
Terminal report	<ul> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>External Consultant</li> </ul>	none	At least one month before the end of the project

Tipy of M&A activity	Responsible parts	Budget USD	Time frame
Lessons learned	<ul> <li>Project team</li> <li>UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit</li> </ul>	30.000	Yearly
Audit	<ul> <li>UNDP CO</li> <li>Project team</li> </ul>	10.000 (average 2.000 per year)	Yearly
Visits to field sites (UNDP staff travel costs to be charged to IA fees)	<ul> <li>UNDP Country Office</li> <li>UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (as appropriate)</li> <li>Government representatives</li> </ul>	62.000	Yearly
<b>TOTAL INDICA</b> Excluding project tean travel expenses	ATIVE COST n staff time & UNDP staff and	355.500	

This Terminal Evaluation considers that the M & E Plan as presented in the ProDoc was properly organized to keep track of Project implementation. The activities, budget and terms were properly defined at the time of project design. Also, the responsibilities and roles, in general, fit the project goals. The only exception is that the M&E Plan should specifically foresee the constitution of a monitoring team and include in its responsibilities the verification of the indicators and the means available to achieve the goals. This would contribute to the adaptive management and probably would correct the mistakes with the results logical framework.

As presented at part 3.1.1 of this report, the evaluation mission, after conducting an analysis of the objective and outcome level indicators, concluded that many of them were difficult to use to measure Project progress. In general, the problems of the indicators are related to the lack of objectivity, to their complexity, and little feasibility for effective measurement. There is also an excess of indicators for each outcome, which makes it difficult to measure if the Project fully accomplished them.

All the activities of the M & E plan were carried out and had satisfactory results. The inception workshop and the initial work of the Project team (including the UNDP CO) generated a satisfactory PIR and prepare the way for the development of the Project initial activities. The reports have a lot of useful information about the Project implementation. Despite the quality of the reports, no problems with indicators were presented either in the technical/annual reports or in the mid-term evaluation report.

The Steering Committee did not perform its role as expected. The information gathered with some participants showed that the Steering Committee meetings worked more as a presentation of the results and plans than a decision-making group. The reasons for this situation can be linked with the complexity of the project, working with 32 reference areas, each of them with their own context and challenges. The size of the Project made it difficult to be followed by a group whose meetings were only once a year.

## The project M&E Plan Implementation was considered Moderately Satisfactory (4).

## The Overall quality of M&E was considered Moderately Unsatisfactory (3).

## 3.2.6 UNDP and implementing partner implementation/execution coordination and operational issues

## **UNDP** implementation

UNDP is an institution recognized in Brazil for its efficiency in the implementation of international technical cooperation projects. The UNDP Sustainable Development Unit Team of the Country Office carried out activities to support the partners' implementation activities by assisting in developing Terms of Reference and making provisions for seminars and travel for field work and participation in events, among other activities.

Progress reports were prepared by the project coordination with support from PMU/UNDP and their contents corresponded to the reality of facts and factors involved in project implementation.

The evaluators consider that there was a good coordination with FUNAI and adequate UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team. The focus on results showed flexibility in implementation, searching for adapted execution tools, such as the mentioned Letters of Agreement, Microprojects and other instruments, in order to speed up implementation. We consider that UNDP performed risk management functions and produced financial oversights satisfactory.

#### The Quality of UNDP Implementation was considered Satisfactory (5).

As for **Implementing Partner execution**, the evaluators consider that there was a good coordination among FUNAI, UNDP, MMA, ICMBio, NGOs and indigenous organizations. Considering the ambitious objectives and the complex institutional arrangement, the project team had to make strategic decisions in order to ensure execution. Strengthening local partnerships and networks, contracting regional experts, adopting innovative implementation instruments (Letters of Agreement, Microprojects, Leverage financing) were some of the adaptive management strategies employed.

Delays caused by the complex consultation and information processes with numerous indigenous organizations and communities and by the setup of the Steering Committee could be partly overcome by these strategies.

The efficient and engaged PMU made efforts to engage the participating FUNAI sectors and to internalize management expertise into FUNAI.

Despite of the effective government ownership highlighted in the conclusion section (4.) as a success factor, the operation of the Steering Committee, with its equal representation of government agencies (MMA and FUNAI) and indigenous representatives, was irregular. The Steering Committee represented an important innovation by the Project, however, after a first phase (2011-2013) of regular meetings, its operation was irregular during the phase in which implementing partners focused on execution of project activities. Also its mandate was not very clear to its members in terms of whether the Committee was a forum for decision-making or just monitoring.

The content of progress reports corresponded to reality and implementation.

The Quality of Execution - Executing Agency was considered Satisfactory (5).

The Overall quality of Implementation/ Execution was considered Satisfactory (5).

## 3.3 Project Results

Project results were published in five volumes summarizing implementation experiences at the regional and local levels and in five thematic volumes that systematize lessons learnt from Project Management; Indigenous Participation; Instruments for Environmental and Territorial Management in ILs; Training in Environmental and Territorial Management; and Agroecology, Agroforestry and Environmental Restoration.

## 3.3.1 Overall results

GATI Project's main objective was the strengthening of indigenous practices of management, sustainable use and conservation of natural resources, and the social inclusion of indigenous peoples, consolidating the contribution of indigenous lands as essential areas for conservation of biological and cultural diversity in Brazilian forest biomes. Other positive impacts arise from the better environmental management and protection of indigenous lands, with effects on the self-awareness and the empowerment of indigenous peoples as well as on the well-being of communities.

<u>With regard to policies and strategies for environmental management in ILs, perhaps one of</u> the more important effects of the project has been its contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI). In 2015, the different ministries put on paper what in effect will be the contribution to PNGATI over the four year federal government budget planning period (2016-2019). The publication of this "Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI" was supported by the project.

The GATI Project also generated an environment of interinstitutional coordination conducive to the inclusion of indigenous issues in public policies related to PNGATI. One should point out the National Policy for Agroecology and Organic Production - PNAPO (Brazil, 2012b) and the National Policy for Technical Assistance and Rural Extension - PNATER (Brazil, 2010).

<u>With regard to interinstitutional cooperation</u>, one should point out the positive coordination triggered by the Project among FUNAI, MMA and ICMBio, which was not the tradition beforehand. This coordination enabled joint discussions on important issues, such as the overlapping of ILs and Conservation Units, the mosaics of protected areas, or joint strategies for protection against encroachment. This coordination was extended to the PNGATI construction process and its first implementation actions.

The overall results, organized by outcomes and outputs, are presented in the following table.

## Table: Overall results attained to objectives and activities

Objective	Overall Results
Immediate Objective: A ground-tested and	→ Goal fully achieved considering that the PNGATI replaced the PNAP and that 32 Indigenous Lands (and not 10 as originally planned) in five forest biomes that carried out ethno-management activities, including the communication and dissemination of information on these activities, exchanges and training. However, no satellite surveys were conducted in the 32 Indigenous Lands to verify ILs deforestation rate.
officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL)	<ul> <li>One of the most important results of the project has been its contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the National Policy on Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI), signed on June 5, 2012 as Decree 7.747. This National Policy matches the Project's immediate objective as it is officially recognized as the national strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands by Indigenous People.</li> </ul>
by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and	<ul> <li>In 2015, the different ministries put on paper what in effect will be the contribution of to PNGATI over the four year federal government budget planning period (2016-2019). The publication of this "Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI" was supported by the project.</li> </ul>
sustainable use of forest biodiversity.	<ul> <li>The final approved version of the "Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI" was published in 2016, providing reference material for all sectors involved in public policies related to indigenous peoples. The Integrated Plan also organize a set of activities and responsibilities for public institutions around the seven axes of the PNGATI.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>With regard to the specific improvements in management of Project reference areas, the project supported a number of ethnomapping and ethnozoning activities (in 16 ILs), some of which resulted in ethnomanagement plans (in 10 ILs). These were either directly carried out by the project or were supported by leveraged funds.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Considering only the project reference areas, and activities either underway or completed, conditions for improved management were achieved on a total hectare basis as follows, according to biome: Amazonia: 2,776,393 ha; Cerrado: 277,385 ha; Atlantic Forest: 70,723 ha; Caatinga: 14,722 ha; Pantanal: 42,749 ha.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>In 2016, the Ministry of Environment recognized the second update of Priority Areas for Conservation, Sustainable Use and Benefit Sharing of the Biodiversity of the Cerrado, Pantanal and Caatinga by means of a Ministerial Order (Portaria) 223. Included in the analysis are the ILs of the three biomes. The "Priority Areas" are public policy instruments that support objective and participatory decision making in the planning and implementation of actions such as the creation of conservation areas, environmental licensing, recuperation of degraded areas, research and inventories, and fostering of sustainable use.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The alternative instrument to measure management effectiveness in ILs created by TNC was applied in Trincheira-Bacajá IL (Pará), in three ILs in the Oiapoque region (Amapá), and in two ILs in the Caatinga Biome (Entre-Serras and Caiçara/Ilha de São Pedro). METT was applied by project consultants in the reference areas but showed inconsistencies as it was not designed for ILs.</li> </ul>

Project Components	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Results
Project Components 1. Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and operate as effective PAs for conserving forest biodiversity and ecosystem services	<ul> <li>Expected Outcomes</li> <li>Strengthened systemic capacities increase the contribution of ILs to national goals for forest conservation</li> <li>Improved management of ILs as effective PAs is sustained in the long-term</li> <li>Reduced encroachment of ILs improves their role as PAs forest protection</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Expected Outputs</li> <li>Guidelines, strategies and standards defined for conservation set- asides and for sustainable use of forests for IL-PAs.</li> <li>Surveillance, protection and monitoring protocols strengthened in areas around and within ILs</li> <li>Sustainable- financing mechanisms proposed for ILs management</li> <li>Capacity building for new roles &amp; procedures for ILs – PAs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Results</li> <li>Goals complied with the adoption and publication of PNGATI and the Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI; with the approval by the Amazon Fund of environmental management projects in Indigenous Lands of the Project: Jumina, Galibi, Uaçá, Wajàpi and Trincheira-Bacajá; with the development of staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio and FUNAI; with guidelines adopted for the preparation of PGTAs in ILs; with the existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of PGTAs.</li> <li>Projects financed by the Climate Fund and the Amazon Fund are underway. The Climate Fund selected 15 projects that work with a total of 20 ILs. Five are in the project reference áreas: Bakairi (MT), Corrego João Pereira (CE) Entre-Serras Pankararu (PE), Xacriabá (MG) and Xerente (TO).</li> <li>Seven PNGATI Training Courses, consisting of five modules each, were held by 2016. In sum, the project and partners developed, tested and consolidated the basic methodology for the PNGATI training courses, consisting of five modules, held during the period of one year, bringing together indigenous leaders and government technicians, of both state and federal agencies. This methodology consisted not only of the basic concepts that were addressed, but also the manner in which each course was planned with local and regional partners and indigenous organizations, consisting mainly of two workshops: (1) Mobilization of partners and establishment of agreements; and (2) Modeling the course liself, with regional adaptations to the contents and their layout. Besides the three courses held by the project and government (FUNAI and MMA) under the coordination of the project's knowledge management consultant (for the Atlantic Forest Biome, the Northeast, and the Cerrado Biome), project partners (IEB and lepé) conducted another four course using the same format in Amazonia, with funding from other sources such as the Moore Foundation and Rainforest Foundat</li></ul>
			• The FNGATE Course for the Certado Biome field its initial and last module in suffe 2016. This course was certified as an extension course by the University of Brasília, and an employee of the Tocantins State Environmental Agency (Naturatins) participated. Although 5 participants representing institutions other than FUNAI, ICMBio, Ibama and MMA employees participated in the three PNGATI training courses, including state agencies (mostly extension), the training of OEMA technicians is a goal that was not achieved satisfactorily. However, the consolidation of the PNGATI training methodology means that more courses are possible, and there is great interest in more local/regional courses that would involve more state agencies.

<ul> <li>In 2016, the Ministry of Finance opened a hiring process for 152 new en ("indigenistas especializados") for FUNAI, to be admitted based on the resul examination. Among the activities attributed to these new employees are: regula management of access to and sustainable use of indigenous lands; formulation, art coordination and implementation of policies directed to indigenous peoples a communities; and planning, organization, execution and evaluation of activities inl the territorial and environmental protection of indigenous lands.</li> </ul>	nployees ts of an tion and culation, nd their nerent to
• The report of the Joint Working Group on ILs and conservation area overlap was p to the presidents of FUNAI and ICMBio on Oct. 13, 2015. However, there is not a cc on the interpretation of indigenous rights according to the Constitution vis-a-vis of principles, such as the legislation concerning conservation areas, and also P directive to implement joint administration plans for overlap areas (Axis 3, Objectiv the absence of a clear legal basis, understanding has been based on a working cc between the two agencies involved (FUNAI and ICMBio), specifically through those in the Joint Working Group. However, the broader application has been subject to i positions since there have been recent changes in directors resulting in pressure institutional positions. Nevertheless, the PNGATI training courses, by bringing indigenous leaders and technicians responsible for conservation areas - those with were specifically targeted - has contributed to a better relationship at the local leve courses have led to an increased awareness on the part of ICMBio employ indigenous leaders are subject to the directives of ILO's Convention 169 and Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The projecct, therefore, has not establishment of regulations as a goal, preferring to operate on the level of cc building that is inherent in the ethomanagement plans (Indicator 10). Indeed, re are of little value if they are not in the interests of the indigenous peoples involved thus not respected. With regards to the standardizing of norms between conservation areas of withey ered value if they are not in the interest set were conserved on the level of cc building that is inherent in the demomanagement plans for ILs, the current understandit they refer to very different situations and realities and thus standardization is no lon as a viable goal. Indeed, the great diversity seen in indigenous leades, both ethnic/cultural and socioeconomic perspective, as well as from the biophysical poin all of which influence patterns and practices of	resented nsensus her legal NGATI's e (b)). In nsensus involved ndividual s to shift together overlaps el. These ees that to of this iewed in ntions in the UN pursued nsensus gulations and are ion area g is that ger seen from the of view, ates that stic. The

approach with fixed norms. As to norms related to land use in zones around indigenous lands (such as buffer zones), this would be highly desirable as a further instrument to promote the conservation value of indigenous lands. Although this idea has not become a reality in terms of any specific directive for properties bordering indigenous lands, Brazil's new Forest Code (Law 12.651, 2012) is now being put into practice through the obligatory Rural Environmental Cadastre (CAR) which requires properties to declare and georeference their legal reserves, and more importantly, the permanent protected areas such as riparian forests, which if deforested must be restored. Although this policy is not specifically directed towards the protection of indigenous lands, the net result, if the law is applied correctly, will be a more favorable landscape matrix for indigenous lands.
• Although no new specific regulations have been created, monitoring and surveillance of ILs is an ongoing activity for FUNAI, in colaboration with Ibama. The ethnomanagement plans, however, are making a significant contribution to monitoring activities in that one of the ethnomapping exercises (map layers) is to identify vulnerable points on the boundaries of indigenous lands, and where possible, step up monitoring in these areas. In Mangueirinha IL (Paraná), FUNAI has carried out a training program in cartography and GPS for indigenous environmental agents and has funded routine monitoring visits in partnership with the indigenous organization that provides the four-wheel drive vehicle. In the Northeast, in Caiçara/Ilha de São Pedro IL, ethnomapping indicated areas that need more signs that identify the area as an IL. A more diffuse effect of the ethnomapping exercises and accompanying field visits, beside registering points of vulnerability, is that younger generations are getting a better idea of the boundaries of the ILs and their territories. Many of the ILs were demarcated in the past, with the help of older generations that accompanied FUNAI expeditions and helped establish limits based on the patterns of historical use and which reflected a more extensive use and knowledge of their territory so participating in the field component of the ethnomapping exercises has been very important. These field visits have also identified a number of cases in which neighboring landowners have either moved or removed boundary markers in order to encroach on the IL. These cases have been brought to FUNAI's attention and will be analyzed on a case-to-case basis, as officially resurveying boundaries is generally an expensive task. However, the fact that the communities become aware of these instances and begin their own monitoring is an important step in preventing further such encroachments. An important step towards unifying approaches to measuring the biodiversity in indigenous lands was achieved with the first Nat

			legal opinion from FUNAI's legal department. This is the first instance of a National Forest Inventory in an indigenous land in Brazil, and the methodology used for sampling woody plants is the basis for ICMBio's Sampling Stations for biodiversity, should further work along this line be of interest in the future.
2. A functioning network of pilot conservation set asides in ILs is in place and is being effectively managed by indigenous people (IPs)	<ul> <li>Increased area (ha) of key forest ecosystems under conservation in IL-PAs</li> <li>Improved connectivity in the landscape increases efficiencies of other PAs</li> <li>Increased management effectiveness in pilot set -asides (measured through an adapted METT)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ethno-zoning of pilot ILs to create conservation set- asides</li> <li>Capacity-building for managing pilot IL set-asides for BD conservation</li> <li>Networking mechanisms set up for IPs and pilot set- asides</li> <li>Awareness raising on the impact of extractive pressures on conservation set- aside services</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>→ Goals complied with 10 ILs with Ethnomanagement plans completed; four Plans in preparation (Climate Fund and Amazon Fund); 11 ILs with some form of ethnomapping carried out. In terms of indigenous lands that are not project reference areas, the Amazon Fund is providing with R\$ 70 million (USD 28 million) of financing for the implementation of management plans in 40 ILs (including three reference areas). Up to 30% of the funding for this action can be used for creating new management plans. With regard to the Climate Fund, besides the five reference areas, another 10 ILs are carrying out their projects of setting up management plans.</li> <li>The Brazilian government's Pluriannual Plan (PPA) for 2016-2019 has in its Objective 1013 (Promoting territorial and environmental management of indigenous lands) established the goal of assisting the preparation or revision of 20 Ethnomanagement plans and implementation of integrated actions in 40 indigenous lands.</li> <li>The initial project goal of setting aside internal "conservation areas" in ILs was shown to be impractical, in that such areas would have to rely on formalizing internal agreements in a manner that often is often foreign to the indigenous communities' practices of social organization and internal governance. The category initially imagined was not realistic in this regard, considering also that the definition of a "sacred area", for example, varies greatly between different ethnic groups - in some cases, it may be a single tree. Nevertheless, in so far as the project stimulated indigenous people to reflect on the state of their lands and its natural resources, through the use of instruments such as a ethnomaping, ethnozoning and ethnomanagement plans, a number of information and knowledge of elders with new tools that are more familiar to younger generations, such as astellite imagery, GPS, video, among others, the project has facilitated an in-depth look at the territories and their natural resources, with the exchange of information and kn</li></ul>

			understanding of what conservation biology calls source-sink dynamics in game populations, and will do their best to maintain source areas undisturbed. These areas may be "permanent" (mostly the case of game refuges) or temporary, as is the case of streams or lakes that are put off limits for a certain period, for example, three years, in order to allow fishery stocks to recover. Another important concern for indigenous communities, especially outside of Amazonia, has been the restoration of riparian vegetation around springs and streams. This is a very pragmatic issue, in that the concern is of maintaining or improving supplies of water for community use, and this justifies the investment made in protecting and recuperating such areas. While these actions can also result in riparian corridors and improved wildlife habitat, this was a secondary concern at the moment. As such, <b>many of</b> <b>the results of the project are still difficult to measure according to the set of</b> <b>indicators initially established</b> . It would be more appropriate to say that many of the gains are in the more diffuse realm of environmental sustainability, in which indigenous culture and traditions are elements that are equally important as conservation values. Nonetheless, the project has made it clear that there is a great potential for continuing to bring together traditional knowledge and conservation biology as these in many cases are the two sides of the same coin, and indigenous peoples are willing and ready to accept new concepts and tools that can improve the management of their territories and natural resources
3. Sustainable and replicable models of forest management, based on ethno-mana- gement principles, are piloted in selected ILs in different forest biomes	<ul> <li>Reduced pressure on pilot conservation set asides in ILs increases long- term viability of forest BD and services</li> <li>Improved protection of rights &amp; welfare of IPs enhances their role as forest custodians</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ethno-management plans developed for NTFP in pilot ILs</li> <li>Piloting agro- ecological techniques using traditional knowledge for the recovery of forest resources</li> <li>Mechanisms piloted to foster production and increase market access for NTFP in selected ILs.</li> <li>Capacity-building programme for sustainable-use and financial management in selected ILs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>→ In spite of difficult to measure indicators for this outcome, the Project has achieved significant results with several local initiatives, namely:</li> <li>• TI Mangueirinha (PR): extractivism of the mate herb now being made in partnership with the company Guayaki, with organic certification and fair trade;</li> <li>• TI Entre Serras (CP): the PGTA includes recommendations for the sustainable use of caroá (Neoglaziovia variegata), whose fibers are used in ritual garments;</li> <li>• Planting of the jussara palm tree, threatened by illegal palmito cutting, in several TIs (Ibirama (SC), Guarani de Bracuí (RJ) and Guarani de Ribeirão Silveira (SP)).</li> <li>• TI Xakriabá (MG): support for the mapping and planning of the extraction of products from the Cerrado.</li> <li>• The Terena of the Caianas Organization (TI Cachoeirinha-MS) carried out the innovative event "AGROECOINDÍGENA 2016" with the support of the municipality of Miranda, Embrapa Agropecuaria Oeste, Embrapa Pantanal, Agraer, IFMS, UFMS, UEMS and Project GATI Project. It was estimated that 1000 people participated in the event, with six indigenous people from 26 communities, who visited areas of the project to learn about agroecological production experiences.</li> </ul>

	• In addition to this experience with 22 families in Cachoeirinha, the Project also supported actions in the Lalima (MS) IT, initially with 15 agroforestry parcels (20x30m) of the men and 10 organic gardens of the women. The latter had great success in terms of contributing to well-being and income generation, and the initiative subsequently expanded to serve 60 women.
	<ul> <li>Through a letter according to the Center for Agroecological Development Sabia, agroecological and agroforestry extension was carried out in 3 reference areas in the Northeast, with the training of young people as multipliers.</li> </ul>
	• With support from the Project, the TNC and lepé partners published a book on the use and knowledge of açaí among the Karipuna people of Amapá. In addition to discussing the açaí value chain, the book also presents techniques for sustainable management, according to the ongoing project with Embrapa.
	<ul> <li>At Trincheira-Bacajá (PA) TI, the Project assisted TNC negotiations to support the harvesting of Brazil nuts in the 2016 harvest, with working capital obtained from USAID project. rmation of inventory for sale with more favorable prices.</li> </ul>
	• At the Araribá (SP) project, the project supported the implementation of agroforestry systems with rubber trees, aimed at generating income. During the implantation phase, planting lines were cultivated with vegetables and other short-cycle plants such as cassava and potato.

Sources: Project Implementation Review (PIR), 2011 to 2016

## Analysis of indicators achievement

The evaluation mission verified the final results of indicators and outcomes. Their situation are presented below. It was also verified that some indicators/targets had design problems (presented in section 3.1.1 – Analysis of LFA).

## IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE:

A ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity.

Indicators (underlined)

1. Increase in the area (ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs that by the end of the project are:

(i) incorporated into a network of ethno-management practices for conservation of different forest ecosystems in Brazil

## Situation / analysis

Goal fully achieved considering that 32 Indigenous Lands (and not 10 as originally planned) in five forest biomes that carried out ethno-management activities, including the communication and dissemination of information on these activities, exchanges and training

(ii) identified as contributing to long term targets of PNAP and part of IL Environmental Management Plan with specific strategies for implementation

Situation / analysis

The indicator is linked to the National Strategic Plan for Protected Areas, which is not implemented. In this case, if the PNGATI is considered to replace the PNAP, the goal was fully achieved.

(iii) % contribution to conservation goals

Situation / analysis

Similar to the previous item: there is a link to the PNAP, which is not operational.

2. % forest cover in ILs that serve as Reference Areas (RA) remains at least the same or increases (as measured by satellite images)

[more accurate estimates of forest cover will be determined as part of ethno management plans and some adjustments may be made to figures]

## Situation / analysis

2014 data point to the fulfillment of 90% of the target, if one considers only 10 Reference Areas (report mentioned). In the case of the actual reality of the Project, there were 32 Reference Areas, indicating full compliance with the target. However, no satellite surveys were conducted in the 32 Indigenous Lands to verify their deforestation rate. The evaluation mission considered the goal fully achieved.

3. Increased management effectiveness in ILs that serve as Reference Areas

Situation / analysis: Inconclusive indicator. See section 3.1.1.

4. Increase in IP capacities for leading and up-scaling environmental management actions for conserving representative forest ecosystems in Brazil IOs, with institutional &technical capacities to execute & monitor IL National Plans & projectsIndigenous initiatives/centres for training in environmental management for BD conservation & sustainable use of natural resources.

Target:

1 - All IO of the 5 regional networks have strengthened capacities\* for environmental management and to execute & monitor IL National Plans & projects.

2- 20 IP in each of the biomes have skill\* required for ethno-environmental management

\*This will be measured by a scorecard to be developed as part of the project's Output 1.4

## Situation / analysis

1 - Partial compliance (according to the 2014 report). The capacity of indigenous organizations was strengthened due to Project activities, with training of their members and their participation in the Project Steering Committee and the PNGATI Steering Committee, in addition to other forums: Rio +20, COP 20 in Lima. However, the current sense of the performance of indigenous organizations is more linked to political mobilization and monitoring and supervision of process and institutions working with indigenous peoples than the direct implementation of projects.

There was capacity building of indigenous organizations due to the actions of the Project, with training of its members and their participation in the Project Steering Committee and the PNGATI Steering Committee, in addition to other forums: Rio + 20, COP 20 in Lima. However, the current sense of OI action is more linked to political mobilization and social control than to the direct execution of Projects.

2 -The indicator is also difficult to measure. See section 3.1.1.

## OUTCOME 1

Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services

# 5.Existence of recognized environmental management standards and targets in Indigenous Lands

## Target

A National Conservation Plan for Indigenous Lands that contains targets for conservation of representative forest ecosystems through environmental management \* exists and is harmonized and integrated with the NPAP and adapted to the environmental and social needs of ILs.

\*this Plan would be aligned with and form part of a National Policy on Environmental Management of IL (PNGATI)

## Situation / analysis

Fully complied with the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands, which was enacted and the Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI, which was published.

<u>6. Resources from existing biodiversity conservation sources used to achieve basic operating standards for environmental management in ILs</u>

Target:

At least 5 of the Reference ILs will receive at least 50% of the costs of basic operations\* from new funding mechanisms that include resources currently only available for biodiversity conservation in Pas for environmental compensationservices.

\*The project will work to determine costs of meeting basic operational standards and will test different funding mechanisms.

Situation / analysis

Full compliance in 2014, with approval by the Amazon Fund for financing of environmental management project in Indigenous Lands of the Project: Jumina, Galibi, Uaçá, Wajàpi and Trincheira-Bacajá.

Absence of up to date data on other financing involving Reference Areas.

7. Staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio, FUNAI, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) aligned to implement and follow specific norms and regulations for ethnomanagement and ethno-zoning in ILs.

Target:

1- At least 20% increase in the number of MMA and FUNAI staff trained to implement and use such norms

2- At least 1 staff member in the OEMAs of the states of SC, MS, BA, PE, AM, PA, AC and RO trained to monitor these norms and regulations

3- IBAMA and ICMBio

4- Competency profiles for MMA/SF and FUNAI have been adjusted to include IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively.

## Situation / analysis

The indicator is multiple, with four distinct targets, making it difficult to verify whether they were achieved.

- 1. According to the 2014 report, 75% of the first goal was achieved. However, this indicator is difficult to prove: is it 20% of the total number of staff of IBAMA, ICMBio and FUNAI?
- 2. The 2014 data point to 80% achievement, if one considers state level staff not necessarily of OEMAs.
- 3. Only one IBAMA staff participated in training (2014 data).
- 4. The indicator appears to have been partially achieved, as FUNAI's bylaws (source of verification) incorporate concepts related to the environment and biodiversity as part of competency profiles.

## 8. Regulations adopted for environmental management in ILs including regulations on:

- 5. ethno zoning in ILs
- 6. land-use in areas surrounding ILs
- 7. management of overlapping IL and UCs
- 8. sustainable use of forest resources of IL

Target

- 5. At least 3 categories of ethno-zoning recognized for: conservation, sustainable use and restoration.
- 6. At least 1 regulation regarding land use in the areas surrounding ILs, e.g., creation of IL buffer zones.
- 7. Norms on homologizing management plans and ethno-plans of IL and UC.
- 8. Agreed-upon standards and limits for use of forest resources

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

## Situation / analysis

1 - Full compliance: FUNAI Technical Note with guidelines for the preparation of PGTAs.

2 - Full compliance: Interministerial Ordinance n. 419 / 2011 regulates the activities of agencies of the federal public administration involved in environmental licensing and establishes categories of distance between enterprises and ILs.

3 - Inappropriate indicator: See section 3.1.1..

4 - Full compliance: The New Forest Code (Law 12,651 / 2012) established legal frameworks in relation to forest resources in ILs.

<u>9. Existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of ethno zoning and plans</u>

## Target:

- 3. All the IL reference areas have established surveillance Protocols and undertaken environmental monitoring
- 4. 50% of the ILs composing the network have established Surveillance Protocols and are developing environmental monitoring systems

## Situation / analysis

- 1. Partial fulfillment: in 2014 there was indication of surveillance plans<sup>16</sup> in four Project ILs. However, the ethno-zoning will not always produce a surveillance plan, as it depends on other factors such as the level of threats to ILs (squatters, land grabbers, loggers, etc.) and the ability to effectively carry out surveillance activities.
- 2. Partial fulfillment in 2014: about ten areas conducted monitoring actions, against fires, invasion surveillance, surveillance of beaches (turtle nesting) etc. Training activities in GPS and mapping were executed, but the understanding of what is an environmental monitoring system is not yet clear.

## OUTCOME 2:

A network of ILs modelling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by indigenous peoples and organizations

10. Number of ethno-management plans in ILs that are:

- 4- developed and tested
- 5- have defined conservation goals
- 6- are officially recognized as meeting established norms for conservation by environmental and indigenous agencies in each region

## Target:

- 4- 10 tested ethno-management plans with defined sustainable use, conservation practices, zones and goals relevant for each of the four forest biomes
- 5- 30 more ILs developing ethno management plans
- 6- All plans in reference areas are officially recognized as meeting norms by environmental agencies in each region

## Analysis / situation:

- Full compliance: 10 ILS (RAs) with Territorial and Environment management plans .
- Full compliance: resources leveraged by other initiatives such as Climate Fund, PDPI and Amazon Fund include the support to PGTAs in more than 30 TIs..

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> - There is no specific definition of surveillance protocols. Each IL must build an surveillance plan adequate to its reality.

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

• Indicator linked to a political factor external to the Project. Fulfillment is partial, in that only one state in Brazil (Acre) recognizes PGTAs as part of public policy.

11. Degree of replication of experiences from Reference Areas to other ILs that improve management effectiveness as measured by increase in the METT scores of a sample of 23 ILS

Target:

- All Poor and Fair have reached at least Good Scores.
- All Good have reached Excellent Scores.
- All Excellent have remained Excellent.

## Analysis / situation:

Inconclusive indicator due to the inadequacy of the METT tool. See section 3.1.1..

## 12. % of indigenous curricula that include information on BD & environmental management e

- IP schools in network.
- IP schools nationwide.
- IP training centers (CFI).

## Target:

- 50% of IP schools in network.
- 10% IP schools across country .
- 100% of 5 CFI.

## Situation / analysis

- Partial fulfillment: 28% of indigenous schools in the network have curricula with information on biological diversity and environmental management.
- Inconclusive. See section 3.1.1..
- Full compliance. All training centers and courses address the themes.

## OUTCOME 3

Sustainable and replicable models of forest management, based on ethno-management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes

## 13. Reduction in unsustainable extractive practices in the RAs

Target:

100% reduction in the Caatinga, Cerrado, Atlantic forest and in the Amazon biome.

## Situation / analysis

Difficult to measure indicator due to lack of quantitative initial data on unsustainable practices, without which it is not possible to determine a percentage. Also, many of the information cannot be collected, because some pactices are prohibited by law (for example, native palm heart cut) and it was not possible for the project to obtain quantitative information about them. Nonetheless, the Project has achieved significant results with several local initiatives, namely:

• TI Mangueirinha (PR): extractivism of the mate herb now being made in partnership with the company Guayaki, with organic certification and fair trade:

• TI Between Sierras (CP): the PGTA includes recommendations for the sustainable use of caroá (Neoglaziovia variegata), whose fibers are used in ritual garments;

• Planting of the jussara palm tree, threatened by illegal palmito cutting, in several TIs (Ibirama (SC), Guarani de Bracuí (RJ) and Guarani de Ribeirão Silveira (SP)).

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

• TI Xakriabá (MG): support for the mapping and planning of the extraction of products from the Cerrado.

<u>14. Increase in the % of IP diet derived from the new agro-ecological production systems in IL Reference Areas in the Caatinga, Cerrado and Atlantic Forest</u>

#### Target:

Communities inside ILs subsist on production derived from agro-ecological production within the zones delimited for this use.

#### Situation / analysis

The indicator is not feasible as it is not possible to measure the diet of all the inhabitants of the 32 indigenous lands. Increase in agroecological production does not necessarily mean that 100% of the diet is based on this type of production, as food trade is a common practice of Indigenous Peoples. Nonetheless, the Project has achieved significant results with several local initiatives, namely:

• The Terena of the Caianas Organization (TI Cachoeirinha-MS) carried out the innovative event "AGROECOINDÍGENA 2016" with the support of the municipality of Miranda, Embrapa Agropecuaria Oeste, Embrapa Pantanal, Agraer, IFMS, UFMS, UEMS and Project GATI Project. It was estimated that 1000 people participated in the event, with 6 indigenous peoples from 26 communities, who in addition to participating in the various workshops, visited areas of the project to learn about agroecological production experiences.

• In addition to this experience with 22 families in Cachoeirinha, the Project also supported actions in the Lalima (MS) IT, initially with 15 agroforestry parcels (20x30m) of the men and 10 organic gardens of the women. The latter had great success in terms of contributing to well-being and income generation, and the initiative subsequently expanded to serve 60 women.

• Through a letter according to the Center for Agroecological Development Sabia, agroecological and agroforestry extension was carried out in 3 reference areas in the Northeast, with the training of young people as multipliers.

15. Increase in the income derived from the trade of NTFPs, including:

- Honey (melipona)
- Fruit: Cashew, açaí, baru
- Handicraft: liana, croá

Target

- ILs in Cerrado, Caatinga, and Atlantic Forest with at least one income-generating agro-ecological activity.
- In the Amazon, 3 of the 4 RAs with trading activities implemented.

#### Situation / analysis

The indicator would require close monitoring of the sources of income of families in target indigenous lands. The indicator is also not feasible as it is impossible to measure due the absense of a monitoring activity for the incomes of the indigenous families involved along time.

Nonetheless, the Project has achieved significant results with several local initiatives, namely:

• With support from the Project, the TNC and lepé partners published a book on the use and knowledge of açaí among the Karipuna people of Amapá. In addition to discussing the açaí value chain, the book also presents techniques for sustainable management, according to the ongoing project with Embrapa.

• At Trincheira-Bacajá (PA) TI, the Project assisted TNC negotiations to support the harvesting of Brazil nuts in the 2016 harvest, with working capital obtained from USAID

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

project. This capital ensured the purchase by the cooperative and the formation of inventory for sale with more favorable prices.

• At the Araribá (SP) project, the project supported the implementation of agroforestry systems with rubber trees, aimed at generating income. During the implantation phase, planting lines were cultivated with vegetables and other short-cycle plants such as cassava and potato. .

## <u>16. Area of fragmented forest restored in IL of Atlantic Forest with native species to improve connectivity</u>

#### Target:

At least 40% of the fragmented areas that are critical to connectivity are in the process of restoration with native species.

#### Situation / analysis

The indicator has proven to be difficult to measure without satellite monitoring of the changes in recovered areas. See section 3.1.1.

## 3.3.2 Relevance

The project focused on support for the management of ILs in Brazil, according to the interest and initiative of their occupants and is thus in conformity with federal legislation that guarantees the rights of indigenous peoples established in the Federal Constitution of 1988 (Art. 231 & 232). It was also in conformity with national policies for the conservation of biodiversity, specifically the National Biodiversity Policy – NBP (2002), and the National Protected Area Plan - NPAP (Federal Decree 5758, 2006). It complied with the NPAP principles, which underline the importance of complementarity between Natural PA and other forms of PAs, including ILs, and recognized and respected the specificities and restrictions of ILs. Brazilian ILs occupy 13,8 % of national territory, and 23% of Brazilian Amazon and thus have a very important contribution to Brazil's commitments to Aichi goals and other international conventions.

The Project contributed to strengthening of biodiversity management in ILs and institutional capacity building for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in ILs. It contributed to strengthening the participation of IPs in the management of PAs and provided valuable inputs to determine targets for ILs' contribution to conservation. Therefore, the Project was aligned with Brazil's environment agenda, as well as the government agenda related the role of indigenous people regarding the conservation of their lands.

The project was also consistent with the GEF SO-1: Catalyzing the sustainability of protected areas/SP3: Strengthening terrestrial protected area networks. Forest protection through Brazil's national protected area system (SNUC) is inadequate to achieve national level conservation targets in terms of forest ecosystems. The project provided an enabling environment to unlock the potential of ILs as PAs for forest conservation thereby complementing the SNUC PAs and closing gaps in forests of globally significant biodiversity. The project was consistent with the SFM Program SO1: To conserve and sustainably use forest biodiversity. It maintained the economic, social and environmental values of globally significant forest in Brazil. It did this by providing systematic and operational capacity-building to indigenous people and relevant Government institutions to strengthen IPs' critical role as forest custodians through the sustained application of their traditional resource management strategies on indigenous lands. It adopted a landscape approach that includes sustainable use areas and conservation sites in pilot ILs and was aimed at generating global environment benefits while supportingd the safeguarding of IP livelihoods.

The Project supported the participatory elaboration and structuring of the National Policy on Territorial and Environmental Management in Indigenous Lands (PNGATI) and trained indigenous leaders and public officials to understand and disseminate the Policy and its management tools.

According to the guidelines for the protection of biodiversity and protected areas of the GEF and the need to achieve the goals of environmental protection and increase the conservation of biological diversity through its sustainable use, the Project is classified as **RELEVANT**.

## 3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency

Project Effectiveness refers to the question: To what extent was the objective achieved?

The immediate objective of the Project was: "A ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity."

As mentioned in chapter 3.1 "Project Design / Formulation", the Project was designed in the context of PNAP and aimed to support the implementation of the National Program for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in ILs. This explains much of the formulation of Outcome 2 with its targets for the creation of voluntary conservation set-asides for biodiversity conservation within ILs. However, with the maturing of discussions between indigenous organizations and the government during the development of PNGATI, this conservationist bias was abandoned, giving way to an approach more centered on indigenous territorial and environmental management.

In this new context, the immediate objective of the Project was reinterpreted as the test of the PNGATI Strategy with its tools and instruments of environmental management. This represents an adjustment with regard to the methods initially set out to achieve project goals, nevertheless, the Project objective was not officially changed and the general objectives continued to be the same. Thus, one can observe that the aim of the Project was fully achieved.

The long-term objective is extremely ambitious and not all outcomes have been achieved, in the sense of the initial design of the Project, but several challenges have become significant unforeseen outcomes, e.g., the institutional strengthening of FUNAI and the absorption of the Project by CGGAM, as well as the Project Steering Committee, with equal representation, where indigenous peoples were protagonists and not just beneficiaries.

With regards to **Efficiency**, the cost-effectiveness can be evaluated as positive. The government counterpart was consistent, even if FUNAI only managed to provide only half of the initially planned cash co-financing.

Both the UNDP and FUNAI were very careful and responsible with the use of resources and responded with flexibility and adaptive management in delicate moments. The small projects and micro-projects resulting from the new strategy had significant impact in terms of outcomes and mobilization of indigenous actors. The Letters of Agreement instrument and the leverage of funds allowed Project execution to be greatly expedited (see 3.2.1 and 3.2.2).

FUNAI's restructuring in 2010 and 2012 resulted, initially, in a loss of efficiency due to delays. There were also efficiency losses because of the difficulty of integrating the 17 Regional Coordination Offices of FUNAI.

The project Effectiveness and Efficiency were considered Satisfactory (5).
# 3.3.4 Country ownership

The GATI Project was fully aligned to demands and to the Brazilian environmental and indigenous policy.

The process of discussion and elaboration started in 2002 by initiative of the Ministry of Environment together with representatives of indigenous peoples. The goal was the development of an Action Plan for Biodiversity Conservation on Indigenous Lands, in the context of the creation of the National Biodiversity Policy. The request for the Project, therefore, also came from representatives of indigenous peoples who were concerned with environmental conservation and the future of their territories.

In 2004, a working group was established involving the following government agencies -Ministry of Environment, Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (Ibama), Ministry of Justice, and FUNAI - and the participation of indigenous representatives from the five regions of the country. Subsequently, a process of regional consultation with indigenous peoples was conducted to give final shape to the proposal submitted to GEF in 2009.

As mentioned in the ProDoc, the Project worked to contribute to the national targets of expansion of protected areas, in accordance with the policy of conservation of protected areas (Federal Decree 5758/2006)<sup>17</sup>. The Project was also aligned with the principles of environmental conservation expressed in the National System for Conservation Units (SNUC), established by Law number 9985 of 2000. Even though indigenous lands are not part of SNUC, the environmental principles governing their protection is the same, considering that they are areas for sustainable and traditional use.

The indigenous movement was one of the main protagonists in the development of the Project, through its regional and national organizations: Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of Brazil (APIB), Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Brazilian Amazon (COIAB), the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples and Organizations of the Northeast, Minas Gerais and Espirito Santo (Apoinme), the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Southeast Region (ArpinSudeste), the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the South Region (ArpinSul), and the Coordination of Indigenous Peoples of the Pantanal (Arpipan). At a later stage, in MatoGrosso do Sul, the Council of Terena Chiefs and the AtyGuasu Assembly were incorporated.

Institutionally, the GATI Project was implemented based on the coordination between the Ministry of Justice, through FUNAI, and the Ministry of Environment, with the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio). Within FUNAI, the General Coordination for Environmental Management, where the PMU was located, worked in partnership with other coordination offices of the institution and 17 Regional Offices, responsible for 32 Indigenous Lands which benefited from the Project. In addition to the intense performance of the FUNAI coordinations, all the commitments to financial support from the government were kept throughout the implementation.

Nevertheless, the Steering Committee did not have the role expected. It was composed by indigenous and governmental representatives and its annual meeting worked more as an opportunity to present the results. It didn't work as a counseling or decision-making body.

Finally, one of the Project's contributions, the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management in Indigenous Lands (PNGATI), regulated by federal decree in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> - GEF/UNDP – "Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous Lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems". Project Document (PIMS 3600), p. 50.

2012, legally instituted many of the Project's advances defining the environmental performance guidelines related to indigenous areas.

All of these factors show the national ownership (present since its origin) of the Project and its outcomes.

# 3.3.5 Mainstreaming

Conformity to priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP)

The Project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the CPAP for Brazil, 2007-2011:

"4.27 Sustainable management of biodiversity – including genetic resources, species, and the ecosystem services that support human development – is central to achieving MDGs. Poverty and biodiversity are intimately linked to development and most initiatives for the next programme cycle will promote environmental sustainability and poverty alleviation by working directly with local communities in developing their capacities to the sustainable use of natural resources. The main target beneficiaries are **indigenous communities** and traditional populations." (bolding added)

## Positive effects of the project on indigenous peoples and their lands

Indigenous peoples and their lands were the target of the project, which worked with 32 indigenous lands inhabited by 27 different ethnic groups, distributed in Brazil's five biomes and 20 states. Besides the general benefits arising from the improved environmental management of indigenous lands, with effects on the well-being of communities, some more specific contributions of the project to the empowerment of indigenous peoples were:

- The project stimulated indigenous people to reflect on the state of their lands and its natural resources, using for this several instruments such as ethnomapping, ethnozoning and ethnomanagement plans, that bring together the traditional knowledge of elders with new tools that are more familiar to younger generations, such as satellite imagery, GPS, and video, among others. The project stimulated indigenous people to ask the following questions that require an in-depth look at their territory and its natural resources, as well as the exchange of information and knowledge between generations: What was the state of our land and its resources in the past? How is our land today? How do we want our land to be in the future?
- Through its participatory approach, in line with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the ILO Convention 169 and UNDP's internal guidelines, which require project actions to be fully discussed and adapted to the needs and desires of the communities as far as possible, the project has brought a greater level of discernment to communities that previously felt they had no choice but to accept projects brought by government agencies or other institutions even if these had no local input.
- The microprojects for individuals and small grants for organizations, with straightforward objectives and goals, and whose proposals were drafted with the help of regional consultants, have brought more confidence and experience to indigenous associations that need to develop project proposals in order to access funding sources.
- Another important aspect of the Project cited by the indigenous peoples involved were the exchanges with other indigenous groups or farmers, whether to visit agroforestry systems, fruit processing facilities or other initiatives related to the management of natural resources and territories. The lessons learned continued to be brought up in conversation even two to three years later.

• Many of the Project benefits are related to indigenous traditions and culture or cultural regain, which are important elements of environmental sustainability.

## Activities carried out to enhance livelihoods and reduce poverty

A highlight of the project was encouraging sustainable economic activities focusing on approaches such as agroecology, agroforestry and ecological restoration. The rotation of different crops and the diversity of species are key elements to maintain the ecological and economic stability of agro-ecological production systems and agroforests. The strengthening of indigenous organizations, the exchange of experiences, and the existence of networks of partners and adapted mechanisms for promotion, such as micro- and small projects were success factors that facilitated the sustainability of measures.

## 3.3.6 Sustainability

## Institutional framework and governance risks

The most important sustainability factor of the project has been its contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI). The project has supported in various ways the establishment and continuity of PNGATI's steering committee, composed of representatives of various ministries as well as indigenous representatives. As such, the committee has become one of the principal venues for different ministries to come together and jointly discuss their policies and budgets with regard to indigenous peoples. In 2015, the government representatives on the Steering Committee spent a good part of the meetings consolidating and putting on paper what in effect will be the contribution of the different ministries to PNGATI over the 4 year federal government budget planning period (2016-2019). The publication of this "Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI" was supported by the project.

Further, the Project strengthened the indigenous environment management theme inside the FUNAI supporting the structure of CGGAM (General Coordination of environment management) and contributing with knowledge to orientate FUNAI's work.

Considering this positive context, the rating for the institutional framework and governance riks is "likely" (L - 4)

#### Financial risks

In addition to the Integrated Plan for PNGATI Implementation, comprising the commitments of government agencies to finance environmental and territorial actions for Indigenous Lands, the availability of international funds (Climate Fund, the Amazon Fund and GEF itself) will become increasingly relevant, as they can offset the loss of financial capacity of the Brazilian state.

As mentioned previously, the indigenous management and conservation of the ILs became a institutional theme over the years (with great contribution of the GATI Project), counting on a budget for the development of initiatives related.

However, the current national economic situation is marked by a deep crisis in the financial capacity of the Brazilian State, which may bring further budget cuts for 2017 and possibly 2018, deepening the trend already indicated in item 3.2.4 Project Finance. This decrease in State action threatens the continuity of indigenous and environmental policies. One of the measures taken to resolve the financial crisis under discussion in Congress is limiting the

expansion of government spending to the inflation of the previous year. This measure, if approved, will generate the reallocation of budgets among different areas, according to the government's prioritization.

So, despite the consolidation and the prevision of budget in the multiannual plan, some decrease of resources can be expected. In this scenario, it is expected that dependence on external funds for PNGATI implementation will increase over the next two years.

Considering the context above, the rating of the financial risk for the sustainability of the initiatives of the GATI Project is moderately "likely" (ML - 3)

## Social and political risks

Historically, indigenous and environmental issues are not a priority for governments guided by the "development at any price" ideology.

In this sense, the National Congress is already discussing a Constitutional Amendment Bill that modifies the rules of demarcation of indigenous lands, whose final approval would lie with Congress. The overrepresentation of the areas of agribusiness and mining contrasts with the sub-representation of minorities, which tends to hinder the recognition of indigenous rights, especially with regard to territorial rights. At the same time, Congress is also discussing the redefinition (decrease) of approved lands and other bills, such as authorizing mining on indigenous lands (PL 1610/1996).

The rating of the social and political risks for the sustainability of the initiatives of the GATI Project is also moderately "likely" (ML - 3)

<u>Environmental risks to the sustainability of Project outcomes</u> No environmental risks related to Project outcomes and sustainability has been identified.

## The rating regarding Overall Likelihood of Sustainability is therefore Moderately Likely (3)

## 3.3.7 Impact

As stated in section 3.3.1 Overall results, the Immediate Objective of the Project,

A ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands by Indigenous Peoples is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity,

was considered as fully achieved with the elaboration and implementation of the PNGATI and its tools.

Considering the Outcomes and Outputs, the Project's main impacts within the project lifespan were the strengthening of indigenous practices of management, sustainable use, protection and conservation of natural resources, and the social inclusion of indigenous peoples, consolidating the contribution of indigenous lands as essential areas for conservation of biological and cultural diversity in Brazilian forest biomes.

There are clear indications that the project enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and improved ecological status by enhancing the protection and sustainable use of indigenous lands. Thus, Project actions reduced the vulnerability of indigenous lands to external and internal threats. However, no quantitative data was generated or could be used by the project (satellite images, quantitative information by the environmental agencies) due to the difficulty in using resources and the low monitoring capacity of the organizations engaged.

In order to face this gap and evaluate the overall performance of the Project, we used elements of the Theory of Change approach, as presented by the Handbook on the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI)<sup>18</sup>. This approach enables a potentially robust indirect measure of the ultimate impact by assessing the logical process linking outcomes to impact.

"Project terminal evaluations are usually conducted at or shortly after project completion, when it is usually only possible to directly assess the achievement of the project outputs and, to a lesser extent, the project outcomes. The long timeframes and lack of long-term monitoring programmes (especially post GEF funding) mean that direct measures of project impacts would require an extensive primary field research that is not possible for routine evaluation work. The ROtl's Theory of Change approach seeks to overcome the challenges of measuring impacts by identifying the sequence of conditions and factors deemed necessary to convert project outcomes into the ultimate impact." (The ROTI Handbook, p. 1)

Using the ROTI rating matrix, we rated Project's Outcomes and Progress toward Intermediate States as follows:

Outcome Rating	Rating on progress toward Intermediate States	Impact Rating
D: The project's intended outcomes were not delivered	D: The conditions necessary to achieve intermediate states are unlikely to be met.	Rating "+": Measurable impacts or threat reduction achieved and documented within the project life-span
C: The outcomes delivered were not designed to feed into a continuing process after GEF funding	C: The conditions necessary to achieve intermediate states are in place, but are not likely to lead to impact.	
B: The outcomes delivered were designed to feed into a continuing process, but with no prior allocation of responsibilities after GEF funding.	B: The conditions necessary to achieve intermediate states are in place and have produced secondary outcomes or impacts, with moderate likelihood that they will progress toward the intended Global Environment Benefit.	
A: The outcomes delivered were designed to feed into a continuing process, with specific allocation of responsibilities after GEF funding.	A: The conditions necessary to achieve intermediate states are in place and have produced secondary outcomes or impacts, with high likelihood that they will progress toward the intended Global Environment Benefit.	

# **Desk-based ROTI rating matrix**

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> The ROTI Handbook: Towards Enhancing the Impacts of Environmental Projects. (4th Overall Performance Study of the GEF, OPS4: Progress toward Impact, 2009). <u>http://gefieo.org/sites/default/files/ieo/ieo-documents/ops4-m02-roti.pdf</u>

We considered the **Outcome rating** as "**A**" – *The outcomes delivered were designed to feed into a continuing process, with specific allocation of responsibilities after GEF funding.* The continuing process is guaranteed by the implementation of the PNGATI and its tools. Likewise, the specific allocation of responsibilities is set in the PNGATI and was promoted by the Project's activities: the interinstitutional cooperation at government level (FUNAI, MMA, ICMBio and others), the role of indigenous communities and organizations, NGOs, universities and research institutions.

Our rating on progress toward Intermediate States is "B" – The conditions necessary to achieve intermediate states are in place and have produced secondary outcomes or impacts, with moderate likelihood that they will progress toward the intended Global Environment Benefit. The "moderate likelihood" is due to external risks: the risk of setbacks in the political guarantee of indigenous land rights at governmental level and to possible pressures of powerful economic actors (agribusiness, mining sector etc.) interested in the natural resources of the ILs.

The rating is based on **three essential factors** that reinforce the progress toward Intermediate States and can guarantee the impact of the Project in the long range.

A first prominent factor in Project design and implementation was the theme of staff training and qualification of actors involved in the territorial and environmental management of ILs, one of the main demands of indigenous peoples along with the theme of sustainable economic activities. Training was considered an important tool for the achievement of the goals and as an instrument to promote knowledge exchange for the development of new knowledge about territorial and environmental management of indigenous lands. In this context, one can highlight the exchanges of experiences as well as experience networks on management fomented by the exchanges. The close relationship between indigenous peoples and public managers and among the institutions themselves (such as FUNAI and ICMBio) is another impact of extreme importance in the context of network operation. Some bodies that did not communicate well in the past, with the training modules were able to establish fruitful dialogue, with the participation of indigenous peoples. This was especially the case of managers of Conservation Units where there are relations with Indigenous Lands; participation in courses allowed for dialogue and partnership opportunities with indigenous communities for the protection and conservation of these protected areas, stimulating joint action and close partnership in the future.

A second important factor was the support for the development and application of **Territorial and Environmental Management Instruments** in ILs, such as Ethno-mapping, Ethnozoning, Ethno-environmental Assessments, and Territorial and Environmental Management Plans of ILs (PGTAs). As of the formalization of these instruments and tools, the development and implementation of PGTAs became federal government's targets and have been included in the Multi-Year Plan (PPA 2012-2015: 51 PGTAs as a shared target of FUNAI and MMA; PPA 2016-2019: another 27 PGTAs). Such zoning and planning tools and instruments, along with PNGATI's legal framework, also facilitate and bring together the financing for actions and measures by donors and development institutions, as shown by the leveraging of the Amazon Fund and Climate Fund.

A third factor was encouraging **sustainable economic activities** focusing on approaches such as agroecology, agroforestry and ecological restoration. The rotation of different crops and the diversity of species are key elements to maintain the ecological and economic stability of agro-ecological production systems and agroforests. The strengthening of indigenous organizations, the exchange of experiences, and the existence of networks of partners and adapted mechanisms for promotion, such as micro- and small projects were success factors that facilitated the sustainability of measures.

Even lacking of quantitative data, there is enough evidence that supports our conclusion:

- a) The gathered information about the micro and small projects (37) showed that at local level their grate majority were responsible for positive environmental impacts: forest and water sources restoration, sustainable food production and creation of new sources of income (with no harm to the environment) for the indigenous people.
- b) The capacity building in conservation and sustainable use of natural resources enhanced the protection of indigenous lands and their natural resources.
- c) With regard to the specific improvements in management of Project reference areas, the project supported ethno-mapping and ethno-zoning activities in 16 ILs and the drawing up of Territorial and Environmental Management Plans (PGTAs) in 10 IL, generating local knowledge about the territory protection, environmental threats and needs, and encouraged the local communities to act, in order to address them.

All in all, the evaluation mission considers that the project enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and improved ecological status in at least the half of the 32 Reference Areas and that the conditions are in place for the intended Global Environment Benefits.

The rating regarding Environmental Status Improvement is **Minimal (2)** The rating regarding Environmental Stress Reduction is **Significant (3)** The rating regarding Progress towards stress / change is status **Significant (3)** 

# 3.4 Ratings

GEF evaluation policy stipulates that ratings should be used to assess project relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, as well as the quality of M&E systems. The following Table presents all the ratings given by the Evaluators, based on the considerations already mentioned.

# **Evaluation Ratings**

(according to Rating Table Template on pp. 29-30, UNDP/GEF Guide for Terminal Evaluations, 2012)

CRITERIA (SCALES)	RATING	COMMENTS
1. Monitoring and Evaluation		
M&E Design at Entry (1-6)	3 (MU)	Low initial indicators' quality and lack of revision.
M&E Plan Implementation (1-6)	4 (MS)	Despite of the fragility of the indicators, the M&E Plan was implemented satisfactorily.
Overall quality of M&E (1-6)	3 (MU)	
2. IA& EA Execution		
Quality of UNDP Implementation (1-6)	5 (S)	Good coordination with FUNAI. Flexibility in implementation, adapted execution tools.
Quality of Execution - Executing Agency (1-6)	5 (S)	Good coordination with UNDP, MMA, ICMBio, NGOs and Indigenous Organizations; Adaptive Management; Efficient and Engaged PMU.
Overall quality of Implementation/ Execution (1-6)	5 (S)	
3. Assessment of Outcomes		
Relevance (1-2)	2 (R)	Constitution (Art. 231 & 232), PNB, PNAP, PNGATI
Effectiveness (1-6)	5 (S)	PNGATI and management tools tested.
Efficiency (1-6)	5 (S)	Compared with other protection strategies minor costs. FUNAI careful with the use of money.
4. Sustainability		
Financial resources (1-4)	3 (ML)	Amazon Fund, Climate Fund, GEF, but low State capacity.
Socio-political (1-4)	3 (ML)	Mobilized IPs and partners, but political drawbacks.
Institutional framework and governance (1-4)	4 (L)	PNGATI and its Steering Committee; Integrated Plan for Implementation of PNGATI (budget 2016-2019).
Environmental (1-4)	4 (L)	Mobilized IPs and partner network.
Overall likelihood of sustainability (1-4)	3 (ML)	
4. Impact		
Environmental Status Improvement (1-3)	2 (M)	By enhancing the protection and sustainable use of indigenous lands.
Environmental Stress Reduction (1-3)	3 (S)	Reduced vulnerability of indigenous lands to external and internal threats.
Progress towards stress/status change (1-3)	3 (S)	IPs and communities trained, PNGATI adopted and its instruments and tools tested.
Overall Project Results (1-6)	<b>5</b> (S)	Satisfactory

**Rating scales used**: (S) - Satisfactory; (MS) - Moderately Satisfactory; (MU) - Moderately Unsatisfactory; (L) - Likely; (ML) - Moderately Likely; (R) - Relevant.

## 4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

## a) General remarks

This evaluation found that the Project achieved its expected outcomes and was conducted satisfactorily during its period of activity. Briefly, one can say that:

- The Project achieved its immediate objective to consolidate and test an environmental and territorial management strategy for indigenous lands with the active participation of indigenous peoples which, effectively, is an instrument for the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity. This strategy was effective both broadly, through the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands, and locally, through the set of actions for the management and planning of conservation and sustainable use of reference areas.
- 2. The Project worked effectively towards the sustainability of its outcomes contributing decisively through funding and technical support to the process of drafting the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI).. The PNGATI is currently the reference for action by the Brazilian government on the subject, and it provides the organizational framework for the planning of all actions related to the topic.
- 3. The Project fully achieved the first expected outcome, namely the development of instruments for the recognition of indigenous lands as areas of effective conservation and protection (through sustainable use) of biological diversity. These instruments were: improving the participatory process of preparing PGTAs, including the impact of their discussion process among indigenous people, with regard to the protection of their territory and their environment; processes related to Territorial and Environmental Management Plans (PGTAs), such as ethno-mapping and development and testing of mapping resources.
- 4. The Project used different sources of funding for its activities, such as external funds (Amazon Fund and Climate Fund), and identified and utilized a number of partnerships for its implementation (NGOs, local indigenous organizations, universities, regional and national indigenous organizations, other ministries and public agencies.
- 5. The financial sustainability of PNGATI, one of the outcomes of the Project, is facilitated by its inclusion in FUNAI's Multi-Year Plan and by the organization of the government's efforts on the theme through the Comprehensive Plan for the Implementation of the National Policy for Environmental and Territorial Management of Indigenous Lands.
- 6. The second expected outcome is considered accomplished by the Project by means of the various pieces of evidence of network action involving reference areas (at the local level) and wider levels (regional). The Project set up these networks through the exchange of experiences and courses bringing together representatives of different indigenous lands. The networks were not limited to indigenous communities, as they also included (through training courses and thematic meetings) civil servants related to the subject from various ministries, representatives of the indigenous movement, and civil society partners.
- 7. The Project achieved its third outcome by testing and consolidating models for forest management and recovery based on ethical principles and according to local indigenous management models and concepts. The evidence is the various forest recovery initiatives based on sustainable use, water sources recovery, and ethno-management of each local arrangement to carry forward these initiatives.

- 8. According with the guidelines for the protection of biodiversity and protected areas of the GEF and the need to achieve the goals of environmental protection and increase the conservation of biological diversity through its sustainable use, the Project is classified as **Relevant**.
- 9. With regards to Efficiency, the cost-effectiveness can be evaluated as positive. The government counterpart was consistent, even if FUNAI only managed to provide half of the initially planned co-financing. Both the UNDP and FUNAI were very careful and responsible with the use of resources and responded with flexibility and adaptive management in delicate moments. The evaluators consider that there was a good coordination with FUNAI and adequate UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team. The focus on results showed flexibility in implementation, searching for adapted execution tools, in order to speed up implementation.
- 10. The most important **Sustainability** factor of the project has been its contribution to the elaboration and implementation of the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands (PNGATI). The project has supported in various ways the establishment and continuity of PNGATI's steering committee, composed of representatives of various ministries as well as indigenous representatives. As such, the committee has become one of the principal venues for different ministries to come together and jointly discuss their policies and budgets with regard to indigenous people.
- 11. Positive **Impacts** arise from the better environmental management and protection of indigenous lands, with effects on the self-awareness and the empowerment of indigenous peoples as well as on the well-being of communities. There are clear indications that the project enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and improved ecological status by enhancing the protection and sustainable use of indigenous lands. Thus, Project actions reduced the vulnerability of indigenous lands to external and internal threats, consolidating their contribution as essential areas for conservation of biological and cultural diversity in Brazilian forest biomes.
- 12. The strengths of the Project were:
  - An efficient collaboration between the Project team, the FUNAI and the UNDP CO.
  - An efficient collaboration among the majority of partners, including the NGOs and the governmental agencies.
  - An effective Project ownership by FUNAI and the CGGAM.
  - The flexibility to support the initiatives proposed by the regional coordinators (built with the indigenous people involved),
  - The agility of hiring services from NGOs and other partners provided by the UNDP CO.
  - The engagement and the stability of the project team, including the consultants and the FUNAI staff.
  - The wide disclosure of the results and the knowledge generated by the Project, through publications with partners.

#### 13. The Project weaknesses identified were:

• The growth of the number of the RAs, from 10 to 32. As the project covered more ILs, the operational capacity to plan and perform the activities was hampered.

GEF Terminal Evaluation of the BRA/09/G32 (PIMS # 3600):

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

- The inadequate design of some of the Project indicators. There were too many indicators, many of them did not follow the criteria of simplicity, objectivity, and measurability.
- The absence of a monitoring team responsible for identifying weaknesses and reviewing the indicators and the strategies for their follow up.
- The irregular operation of the steering committee which did not work as a decision making and council group.

# b) Specific conclusions, lessons and recommendations for future initiatives related to Project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

## Conclusion 1:

The Steering Committee, with its equal representation of government agencies (MMA and FUNAI) and indigenous representatives, represented an important innovation by the Project. However, its operation was irregular. The interviews showed that its powers were not very clear to its members in terms of whether the Committee was a forum for decision-making or just monitoring.

## Recommendation:

In new initiatives involving indigenous peoples and government agencies, the monitoring and operation of the Project Steering Committee (with the participation of indigenous leaders and government officials) should be safeguarded. Its duties and responsibilities, including the committee's decision-making level and its role in monitoring, social oversight, and evaluation should be better defined. The meetings should be regular, and evaluations, decisions and modifications suggested by the committee should be recorded.

#### Conclusion 2

The Outcome indicators formulated for the Project text did not follow the criteria of simplicity, objectivity, and measurability. The text of the indicators was overly complex, and the provision on feasibility of monitoring was inadequate. Throughout the Project, the PMU tried to respond to this complexity, reporting activities and results that met the outcomes. However, the original design of the indicators hindered their effective use to measure the achievement of expected outcomes.

#### Recommendation:

In a forthcoming initiative, the process of elaboration of indicators (during the stage of Project definition and planning) should be discussed among participating consultants and bodies. There should be a specific check on the quality of the indicators proposed to ensure their feasibility as Project instruments.

#### Recommendation:

After the beginning of the Project, there should be an opportunity to correct any problems with the indicators, or replace them, while maintaining their original intent. The identification of problems should be carried out during the Mid-term Review, and a substantive review should be proposed. The Review should not be guided by the guarantee of success in achieving the goals, but by indicators' feasibility of measurement. Suggestions for modifications, brought about by the reality of Project implementation, can be gathered by the executing team, consolidated before the Mid-term Review, and discussed during it.

#### Conclusion 3:

The design of the PMU in the GATI Project did not have an area or personnel responsible for monitoring progress towards the goals set out in the ProDoc. All of the responsibility for implementing the monitoring befell the team responsible for implementing the activities. The

lack of a team or a professional responsible for monitoring indicators also hindered their analysis and monitoring.

## Recommendation:

In new initiatives, ProDocs should provide for an area or personnel to be responsible for monitoring indicators, which can be combined with Project communication tasks. The designated monitoring individual/ team could be responsible for monitoring activities, progress of indicators, assessing the strategies employed, and the systematization and dissemination of information at different levels: steering committee, institutional reports, donors, publications to disseminate results, etc.

## Conclusion 4:

After the beginning of the Project in 2010 and the establishment of the PMU in the following year, there was a period of consultation and discussion with the indigenous peoples of the 32 areas to obtain consensus among beneficiaries about the planning of local actions. This activity of consultation was extensive and took a long time during the Project, requiring further extension of its end date.

## Lesson learned:

The activity fulfilled the guidelines of Convention 169 of the International Labour Organisation, comprising the requirement for prior consultations to obtain free and informed consent of the groups involved before the implementation of any public policy or government action. This period of consultation, however long, generated opposite reactions among beneficiaries: while it strengthened the Project by increasing indigenous participation and receiving from the groups the direction necessary for action, increasing the chances of positive outcomes, it also created expectations regarding performance that were frustrated by the delay of the very consultation stage. In addition, the expansion of the number of reference areas also required longer consultations.

However, direct communication with indigenous groups in the villages, and not only through individuals representing communities, was instrumental for Project strengthening.

## Recommendation:

In a forthcoming initiative in the same subject area, a more expedited plan should be prepared, based on the Project experience. Communities already consulted and with their plans already defined, could start their activities while other indigenous lands are being consulted. This reduces the chances of frustrated expectations. In this way, the Project will not suffer as many delays in implementing the activities.

## Conclusion 5:

The Project worked efficiently as it balanced the institutionalization of actions and their incorporation by the public agency in charge (FUNAI), and streamlined direct execution, using partnerships and mechanisms not provided for initially. Execution by FUNAI suffered delays due to bureaucracy and slow approval of activities. One of the proofs of the difficulty of execution by the institution is the number of approvals that must be obtained by several staff (with no less than six steps in different departments) for procurement by FUNAI's Regional Coordination. Since each department has its own rhythm, its own priorities and forms of control, purchases occurred slowly. On the other hand, the fact that the institution's staff was mobilized, enabled incorporation of the actions and experiences generated by the Project. As of 2014, UNDP was used increasingly to make purchases and contracts (through letters of agreement and microprojects), which accelerated execution. This balance was necessary for the institution to incorporate the knowledge generated, and so that the activities could be carried out without being compromised due to delays.

## Lesson learned:

The balance achieved by the Project between its institutionalization and its implementation in part independent of FUNAI should be used right from the start of activities.

## Lesson learned

Although there was no change in Project objectives or outcomes, adaptive management was more intensively used during execution. The implementation of activities through various ways (through the regional coordination of FUNAI for micro- or small projects, through letters of agreement with partners) proved to be a valuable strategy and largely responsible for the Project's success.

## Lesson learned:

The use of various levels of partnership (national, regional and local) with NGOs, universities, indigenous organizations, and local indigenous associations proved to be an effective way of executing activities. Both the Project's technical capacity and its ability to operate locally were multiplied (using the capacity of partners). It would have otherwise been much more difficult to operate in 32 areas from a base in Brasilia. In the case of local indigenous associations and regional organizations, there was an exchange of benefits: Project activities relied on the experience and activities of indigenous peoples and their organizations were strengthened by the Project.

## Conclusion 6

There was a close approach and effective coordination among the different government institutions working on the Project. FUNAI and the Ministry of Environment (represented by ICM-Bio) actually managed to coordinate their efforts to achieve Project outcomes.

## Lesson learned:

The Project demonstrated that coordination among different Ministries is not only possible but desirable, as it promoted the necessary synergies for the planned activities. The training of officials of quasi-governmental bodies was also important to disseminate the value of the Project's objectives, knowledge on the theme of Indigenous Lands, and their role in the conservation of biological diversity. The model used should be replicated in other opportunities.

## Conclusion 7

The GATI project experience demonstrated that **METT** (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) is an inadequate and inappropriate instrument for measuring environmental management effectiveness in indigenous lands.

#### Lesson learned:

For other GEF indigenous projects related to environment, other instruments should be applied, such as the tool developed by The Nature Conservancy in partnership with the GATI project based on the METT. This tool was applied in seven of the project's reference areas, and besides showing a greater robustness, had a good acceptance by the communities involved.

## c) Actions to maintain or enhance the benefits generated by the Project

The financial sustainability of PNGATI, one of the Project's outcomes, is expected with its inclusion in FUNAI's Multi-Year Plan and in the organization of the government's efforts in relation to the subject through the Integrated Plan for Implementation of the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands. However, the Integrated Plan needs to maintain its pace of implementation, relying on both the budgets of FUNAI and the Ministry of Environment, and the international funds in this field: the Climate Fund and the Amazon Fund.

It is essential that both institutions, MMA and FUNAI, maintain the momentum towards continuing conservation initiatives in indigenous areas, territorial and environmental management plans, and environmentally sustainable economic alternatives.

The experience generated by the Project can and should be harnessed for future PNGATI initiatives.

## d) Proposals for the future that highlight the main objectives of the Project.

As mentioned previously, the National Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management in Indigenous Lands should be fully implemented by various ministries and government authorities, also relying on existing international financing funds.

Using the experience built with the Project, activities such as conservation, recovery of degraded areas, water sources and riparian forests, and sustainable economic alternatives can be replicated in other indigenous areas with adaptations to local contexts.

Thus, the Project should be a model for the environment policies involving conservation, indigenous people and their territories. Therefore we recommend a more intense partnership between FUNAI and the environmental government agencies, in order to ensure not only more support but also the provision of surveys and quantitative data on project impacts.

# e) Project's best and worst practices on issues related to relevance, performance and success.

No practices and actions that hindered the implementation of the Project were identified. Based on the interviews with the various stakeholders, actions were not perceived as systematically undermining Project progress. The corrections detected were explained in the above-mentioned recommendations.

As positive practices during Project implementation, one should first of all highlight the good coordination achieved between UNDP and FUNAI. Interviews and analysis of the outcomes showed that there was synergy between the institutions and both targeted their activities to ensuring the success of the Project.

The freedom granted to regional coordinators to implement alternatives of action and to plan activities locally in a participatory manner with beneficiaries should also be stressed as a beneficial practice of the Project. This was one of the ways to adapt the Project to various local contexts.

The efficiency and the engagement of the PMU as well as the good liaison between the Project Technical Coordinator and the CGGAM / FUNAI Coordinator during the execution should also be viewed as a successful practice. The relationship of trust that was established, and especially the shared understanding of the Project challenges and objectives should be emphasized as a basis for successful implementation.

# 5 Annexes

## 5.1 Terms of Reference

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *BRA/09/G32* - Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems (PIMS # 3600.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

Project Cat	Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems									
Title:										
GEF Project ID:	2934		9	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)					
UNDP Project ID:	3600	GEF financing:	6,0	00,000	6,000,000					
Country:	Brazil	IA/EA own:	0,000	400,000						
Region:	Latin America Government:		24,018,151.94		24,018,151.94					
Focal Area:	BD/SFM	BD/SFM Other:		77,570	3,777,570					
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	SFM-SO1; BD- SP3	Total co-financing:		195,721.94	28,195,721.94					
Executing Agency:	FUNAI	Total Project Cost: 34,195,72		195,721.94	34,195,721.94					
Other Partners	MMA and	ProDoc Signatur	re (date project began):		30/10/2009					
involved:	Indigenous Organizations	(Operational) Closing Da		Proposed: 30/10/2014	Actual: 31/12/2016					

#### **OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

The project was designed to adopt a ground-tested and officially recognized strategy for environmental management in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) for the effective conservation and sustainable use of forest biodiversity. The Project will achieve this through the following three Outcomes and their related Outputs: (i) Mechanisms and tools have been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthened as effective areas for conserving forest biodiversity, natural resources and the environmental services, (ii) A network of ILs modeling environmental management practices for conservation in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizations, and (iii) Sustainable and replicable models of forest management , based on ethno-management principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different forest biomes. Direct global benefits to be delivered include: an increase in the area (4,563,933 ha) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs located in areas of high priority for biodiversity conservation; maintaining forest habitats in these areas at same or higher levels; improved connectivity between PAs; and improved management effectiveness in the RAs.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

#### **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

An overall approach and method<sup>19</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance**, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the <u>UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects</u>. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (<u>Annex C)</u>. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Brasília, including the following project sites: Bracuí IL in Rio de Janeiro (nearby Paraty) and Cachoeirinha, Lalima e Taunay-Ipegue ILs in Mato Grosso do Sul (nearby Miranda). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC), the National Indigenous Affairs Foundation (FUNAI), Ministry of Environment (MMA), the Brazilian Articulation of Indigenous Peoples (APIB), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Institute for Society, Population and Nature (ISPN), Technical and Regional Consultants, and UNDP.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in <u>Annex B</u> of this Terms of Reference.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (<u>Annex A</u>), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in <u>Annex D</u>.

Evaluation Ratings:	Evaluation Ratings:					
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating			
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation				
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency				
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution				
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating			
Relevance		Financial resources:				
Effectiveness		Socio-political:				
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:				
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :				
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for</u> <u>Development Results</u>, Chapter 7, pg. 163

## **PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE**

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul> <li>In-kind support</li> </ul>								
• Other								
Totals								

#### MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

#### IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>20</sup>

#### **CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS**

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Brazil. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

#### **EVALUATION TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	03 days	November 03 <sup>rd</sup> , 2016.
Evaluation Mission	07 days	November 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2016.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: <u>ROTI Handbook 2009</u>

Draft Evaluation Report	10 days	November 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2016
Final Report	10 days	December 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2016.

#### **EVALUATION DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities	
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO	
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO	
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs	
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.	

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

#### **TEAM COMPOSITION**

The evaluation team will be composed of 2 international /national evaluators. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects; one of the evaluators will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience.
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF.
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies.
- Technical knowledge in natural resources management, and/or biodiversity and/or sustainable forestry management or other related areas.
- Experience in evaluation and/or implementation of projects with indigenous peoples is an asset.

#### **EVALUATOR ETHICS**

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the <u>UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'</u>

#### **PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

%	Milestone
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft terminal evaluation report
60%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## **APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to apply by e-mail by September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

# ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK|

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verificatio n Sources	Assumptions
LONG TERM OBJECTI VE	Consolidation of India ecosystems and as con for Indigenous Lands.	genous Lands (ILs) as essential protection of the National Prot	rotected areas for the conservation tected Areas Plan (PNAP) and En	of biodiversi vironmental N	ty in Brazilian forest Aanagement Policies
IMMEDI ATE OBJECTI VE: A ground- tested and officially recognized strategy for environme ntal manageme nt in Indigenous Lands (IL) by Indigenous Peoples (IP) is adopted in Brazil for the effective conservatio n and sustainable use of forest biodiversit y	<ol> <li>Increase in the area (ha.) of representative forest ecosystems of Brazil under conservation through the recognized environmental goals of ILs that by the end of the project are:         <ol> <li>incorporated into a network of ethno-management practices for conservation of different forest ecosystems in Brazil</li> <li>identified as contributing to long term targets of PNAP and part of IL Environmental Management Plan with specific strategies for implementation</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	1. Currently ILs in different forest biomes provide conservation to forest biodiversity but the contribution to national conservation plans and targets is not measured nor are the IPs management practices readily translated into terms that can be recognized and funded through resources available for biodiversity conservation. The potential for contribution to Brazil' conservation goals is thus not fully recognized.         % of biome under protection in SNUC*; in all ILs; and that is currently measured & recognized conservation network         Biome       % ha. %       %         Main       8.0         *       6.0       8.0         *       4.0       3.0         ***       4.0       21.0	Biome (i) ILs (ha.) in (interventional field of the project. But here an estimate is made that, at the end of the project, the area in the plan will be triple that in the network (iii) % contribution to conservation goals  Biome % of # % in I IL s in ILs network network  Cerrado/P** 10 0.0 Caatinga 5 0.1 A.Forest*** 6 0.1 Amazon 30 1 *SNUC is the Brazilian National Protected Area System ** This includes ILs in the Pantanal with transition forest *** Atlantic Forest	1.(i) Project Reports; approved ethno- manageme nt plans; BD monitorin g reports 1. (ii) Relevant sections of the IL Environm ental Managem ent Plan and NPAP	-The government maintains current commitment to work as a partner of the IPs to ensure conservation in ILsThe IPs continue participating in conservation of ILs and show at least current levels of interest for engagement with project-IPs continue to show a unified and consistent voice through the regional IOs- Indigenous Organizations-IOs have sufficient capacities to participate in the execution and monitoring of the National IL Environmental Management Plan

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline		Target		Verificatio	Assumptions
	2. % forest cover ILs that serve as Reference Areas (RA) remains at least same or more (as measured by Satellite images) [more accurate estimates of forest cover will be determined as part of ethno management plans and some adjustments may be made to figures]	IL (RA) <sup>21</sup> % cd 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	forest         N           98         98           98         98           98         98           60         40           90         45           90         98           40         90           45         90           98         40	IL (RA) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	% forest cover     1       98     98       98     98       70     50       90     55       90     98       50     98       50     98	2.Satellite images and ethno- manageme nt plans and monitorin g systems	thereby up-scaling lessons learnt through project to fully unleash IL contribution to conservation targets -Climate changes negatively affect the biodiversity in ILs
	3. Increased management effectiveness in ILs that serve as Reference Areas	See table in row al	pove	See table	in row above	3. Adapted METTS	
OUTCOM	<ul> <li>4. Increase in IP capacities for leading and upscaling environmental management actions for conserving representative forest ecosystems in Brazil</li> <li>7- IOs, with institutional &amp; technical capacities to execute &amp; monitor IL National Plans &amp; projects</li> <li>8- Indigenous initiatives/centres for training in environmental management for BD conservation &amp; sustainable use of natural resources</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9- Today COIAB, F CIR have institut capacity for the e ethno-manageme zoning plans. No capacity to execu- plan of environm management.</li> <li>10- A Centre Indigenous traini the Amazon CAI 2006 trained 15 I environmental m but this does not standards and pra ethno-zoning for conservation. C do not have Cent trained IPs</li> </ul>	FOIRN and tional execution of ent and ethno- one has the ite a national mental e for fing exists in F1 and in IPs in anagement include actices for BD Other regions res or	<ul> <li>11- All IO of the 5 regional networks have strengthened capacities* for environmental management and to execute &amp; monitor IL National Plans &amp; projects.</li> <li>12- 20 IP in each of the biomes have skill* required for ethno-environmental management</li> <li>*This will be measured by a scorecard to be developed as part of the project's Output 1.4</li> </ul>		Staff profiles in IOs Certificate s of Course Completio n in the CFIs Scorecard s to be developed in project and applied at end of year 1; mid-term and end of	
E 1 Mechanis ms and tools have	5.Existence of recognized environmental management standards and targets in	A National Prote Plan (PNAP) exis the establishme comprehensive protected areas contributions from	ected Areas sts to guide nt of a system of including n ILs s but	A Nationa for Indig contains conservat forest e environm	al Conservation Plan genous Lands that targets for ion of representative cosystems through ental management *	National Policy for Environmen tal Policy in ILs (PNGATI)	-National Policy on Environmental Management in ILs is developed in timely manner

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> RA: Amazon: 1.Mamoadate, 2.Igarapé Lourdes, 3.Andirá Marau. Cerrado/Pantanal: 4.Pirakuá, 5.Lalima. Atlantic Forest: 6.Xocleng de Ibirama, 7.Caramuru-Paraguaçu, 8.Guarani do Ribeirão Silveira, 9.Guarani do Bracui. Caatinga: 10.Pankararu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> The ranges were established using the WB/WWF METT slightly adapted to better fit the ILs. Total points = 87 points, including additional items and excluding questions 24, 25 and 26. Poor= < 25% (0–22 points); Fair=26–50%: (23–43 pts), Good= 51–76%: (44-66 pts); Excellent= 77–100%: (67-87 pts)- see ANNEX 6 on the METTs. Management effectiveness tools designed for IL will be developed as part of the project to more accurately measure strengthened management

Project Strategy	Indicator Baseline		Target	Verificatio n Sources	Assumptions
been developed that enable Brazil's ILs to be recognized and strengthene d as effective areas for conserving	Indigenous Lands	no specific targets, standards or practices for these are defined. In Sept 2008, a working group (GTI) was established to elaborate a proposal of National Policy for Environmental Management in IL	exists and is harmonized and integrated with the NPAP and adapted to the environmental and social needs of ILs *this Plan would be aligned with and form part of a National Policy on Environmental Management of IL (PNGATI)	IL Conservatio n Plan Proceedings of Meetings of FUNAI and MMA/SBF on harmonizin o Plans	with support from FUNAI and MMA thereby increasing the dialogue on more effective environmental management -State Environmental
forest biodiversit v. natural				Project Reports.	Agencies incorporate the new policies to
y, natural resources and the environme ntal services	6. Resources from existing biodiversity conservation sources used to achieve basic operating standards for environmental management in ILs	ILs currently do not receive funding for environmental management activities from public funding sources for biodiversity conservation. Isolated support from NGOs to undertake environmental management and/or territorial surveillance activities in the ILs of Oiapoque, Amapá and Kayapó	At least 5 of the Reference ILs will receive at least 50% of the costs of basic operations* from new funding mechanisms that include resources currently only available for biodiversity conservation in PA. environmental services compensation *The project will work to determine costs of meeting basic operational standards and will test different funding mechanisms.	Budget resources from FUNAI and MMA destined to environme ntal manageme nt in IL. Financial reports of ILs	support ethno- management plans at levels that enable the replication of experiences across all States -Contribution of ILs to BD in each forest biome is successfully measured in IL. RA during the project life
	7. Staff competencies and skills in MMA, IBAMA, ICMBio, FUNAI, OEMAs and/or municipal agencies) aligned to implement and follow specific norms and regulations for ethno-management and ethno-zoning in ILs.	<ul> <li>10. &lt;20% of MMA/SBF trained on ethno- management and ethno- zoning plans for ILs</li> <li>11. &lt;15% of FUNAI has core groups of staff trained on environmental management and sustainable use activities in IL</li> <li>12. OEMAs do not have staff trained on environmental activities in ILs</li> <li>13. IBAMA and ICMBio</li> <li>14. Staff requirements in MMA/SBF and FUNAI do not include profiles for IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>15. At least 20% increase in the number of MMA and FUNAI staff trained to implement and use such norms</li> <li>16. At least 1 staff member in the OEMAs of the states of SC, MS, BA, PE, AM, PA, AC and RO trained to monitor these norms and regulations</li> <li>17. IBAMA and ICMBio</li> <li>18. Competency profiles for MMA/SF and FUNAI have been adjusted to include IL/IP and biodiversity conservation respectively</li> </ul>	Project Reports; report on the developm ent of qualificati on programs. Annual monitorin g reports. Legal register of the submissio ns to the judiciary.	-Increase in the public resources for fficient to support new strategies of environmental management is at levels high enough to upscale experiences from RA
	<ul> <li>8. Regulations adopted for environmental management in ILs including regulations on:</li> <li>13- ethno zoning in ILs</li> <li>14- land-use in areas surrounding ILs</li> <li>15- manageme nt of</li> </ul>	17- 0 18- 0 19- 0 20- 0	<ul> <li>21- At least 3 categories of ethno-zoning recognized for: conservation, sustainable use and restoration.</li> <li>22- At least 1 regulation regarding land-use in the areas surrounding ILs e.g creation o IL buffers zones</li> <li>23- Norms on homologizing management plans and ethno-plans of IL</li> </ul>	8. Specific decrees instituting each of these regulation s	

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verificatio n Sources	Assumptions
	overlapping IL and UCs 16- sustainabl e use of forest resources of IL		and UC 24- Agreed-upon standards and limits for use of forest resources		
	9. Existence of surveillance and monitoring plans with standards and practices defined to support the implementation of ethno zoning and plans	<ul> <li>25- Only ILs that were part of PPTAL in the Amazon have surveillance and monitoring protocols and carry out inspection activities in ILs but these do not contain environmental monitoring nor are they related to specific ethno- zones and their goals</li> <li>26- ILs in other forest biomes do not have surveillance and monitoring protocols and only have Indigenous Surveillance (observation) Stations that are not related to zoning</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>27- All the IL reference areas have established surveillance Protocols and undertaken environmental monitoring</li> <li>28- 50% of the ILs composing the network have established Surveillance Protocols and are developing environmental monitoring systems</li> </ul>	Environm ental monitorin g reports Surveillan ce Protocols METT Project Reports	
OUTCOM E 2: A network of ILs modeling environme ntal manageme nt practices for conservatio n in different forest biomes is in place and is being effectively managed by the indigenous peoples and organizatio ns	<ul> <li>10. Number of ethno-management plans in ILs that are:</li> <li>29- developed and tested</li> <li>30- have defined conservation goals</li> <li>31- are officially recognized as meeting established norms for conservation by environmental and indigenous agencies in each regional</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 communities in Oiapoque are testing environmental management strategies</li> <li>0</li> <li>Today about 60% of the RAs have conserved areas but their contribution to biodiversity conservation is not measure not recognized officially by relevant institutions ( eg FUNAI and IBAMA/OEMAS)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>10 tested ethno- management plan with defined sustainable use, conservation practices, zones and goals relevant for each of the four forest biomes</li> <li>30 more ILs developing ethno management plans</li> <li>All plans in reference areas are officially recognized as meeting norms by environmental agencies in each region</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Ethno- manage ment Plans and Ethno- zoning maps</li> <li>Project Reports</li> <li>Official docume nts recogni zing Plans</li> </ul>	-Implementation of the ethno- management plans effectively demonstrate the contribution of ILs to conservation of BD -Ethno- management experiences are efficient and guarantee high replicability
	11.DegreeofreplicationofexperiencesfromReferenceAreastootherILsthatimprovemanagementeffectivenessasmeasuredby increasein theMETTscoresofa sample of 23 ILS12.% ofindigenouscurriculathat includeinformationonBD &environmentalmanagement32-IP schoolsin network33-IP schoolsnationwide34-IP training	METT for a sample of 23 ILs: Poor: 0 Fair: 9 Good: 9 Excellent: 5 35- 0% of 30 (at least 1 per IL of network) 36- 0% of 2422 (FNDE 2006) 37- 1 for the whole Amazon region.	All Poor and Fair have reached at least Good Scores All Good have reached Excellent Scores All Excellent have remained Excellent 38- 50% of IP schools in network 39- 10% IP schools across country 40- 100% of 5 CFI	METT reports • School curricul a • CAFI curricul a • Project reports	-Coordination processes allow an efficient replicability and exchange of experiences within the life time of the project at regional and national levels

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Verificatio n Sources	Assumptions
OUTCOM E 3 Sustainable and	13. Reduction in un- sustainable extractive practices in the RAs	The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans	100% reduction in the <i>caatinga</i> , <i>cerrado</i> Atlantic forest and in the Amazon biome.	Project reports and ethno g reports reports Pragmented ar subject restoration activities show conservation	
replicable models of forest manageme nt , based on ethno- manageme nt principles, are piloted in selected ILs from different	14. Increase in the % of IP diet derived from the new agro- ecological production systems in ILs Reference Areas in the Caatinga, Cerrado and A.F	IPs in Amazon get food from in the IL. IPs diet in Cerrado and the Atlantic Forest comes from locally grown crops and food bought in regional markets IPs in Caatinga grow and gather food in IL, exerting high pressure on the few resources available Base line values will be established by ethno-zoning & ethno-management plans	Community inside IL subsist with production derived from agro-ecological production within the zones delimited for this use	Project Reports	-Pressure on natural resources in ILs increases as new resource use- options become more effective. -Population levels in some ILs are at levels that enable new agro-
forest biomes	<ul> <li>15. Increase in the income derived from the trade of NTFP, including:</li> <li>41- Honey (melipona)</li> <li>42- Fruit: Cashew, açaí, baru</li> <li>43- Handicraft: liana, croá</li> </ul>	Income unknown at present. Unit prices are Product Amt. Pr Açaí I It. 9. Conc. Native Bee 235g. 18 Honey Babaçu 90g. 2. soap Baru nut 200g. 12 Soap Baru nut 200g. 12 Copim 19x13x7 50 Caainga 1m <sup>2</sup> 20 Croá Note: The exact value of the income will be measured by end of year 1	<ul> <li>ILs in Cerrado, Caatinga, and Atlantic Forest with at least one income- generating agro-ecological activity</li> <li>In the Amazon, 3 of the 4 RAs with trading activities implemented</li> </ul>	- Adapted METT and Project Reports - Amount of Income	ecological options to cover dietary needs and this reduce deforestation
	16. Area of fragmented forest restored in IL of A. forest with native species to improve connectivity	The base line values will be established by ethno-zoning and ethno-management plans	At least 40% of the fragmented areas that are critical to connectivity are in the process of restoration with native species	Project Reports IL Environm ental monitorin g reports	

## ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- ProDoc;
- Annual PIRs Project Implementation Reports (2010-2016);
- Annual Operational Plans (AOPs/POAs);
- Mid-Term Review;
- Project Tracking Tools;
- List of technical reports/documents produced and respective Terms of Reference;
- Financial data including co-funding data and audit reports, whenever applicable;
- Minutes of the Final Seminar of the Project;
- Sample of Project Communication Materials.

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sour
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF foca	I area, and to the environment and developmer	nt priorities at th
•	• 111	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of	the project been achieved?	
•	•	•
•	•	•
•		•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international	and national norms and standards?	
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-econom	nic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long	g-term project re
•	•	•
•	•	•
•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enab	led progress toward, reduced environmental	stress and/or ir
•	•	•
•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings	
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings	<ol> <li>Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</li> </ol>	2. Relevant (R)	
5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks	1 Not relevant (NR)	
3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):	2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant		
significant shortcomings	risks	Impact Ratings:	
<ol><li>Unsatisfactory (U): major problems</li></ol>	1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<ol><li>Significant (S)</li></ol>	
1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe		2. Minimal (M)	
problems		1. Negligible (N)	
Additional ratings where relevant:	I.	1	
Not Applicable (N/A)			
Unable to Assess (U/A			

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

## **Evaluators:**

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might

negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

# **Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**<sup>23</sup>

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the U	N System
---	----------

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *place* on *date* 

Signature:

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>24</sup>

i.	Opening page:		
	<ul> <li>Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project</li> </ul>		
	UNDP and GEF project ID#s.		
	<ul> <li>Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Region and countries included in the project</li> </ul>		
	GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program		
	<ul> <li>Implementing Partner and other project partners</li> </ul>		
	Evaluation team members		
	Acknowledgements		
ii.	cutive Summary		
	Project Summary Table		
	Project Description (brief)		
	Evaluation Rating Table		
	<ul> <li>Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons</li> </ul>		
iii.	Acronyms and Abbreviations		
	(See: UNDP Editorial Manual <sup>25</sup> )		
1.	Introduction		
	Purpose of the evaluation		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup>www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

#### GEF Terminal Evaluation of the BRA/09/G32 (PIMS # 3600):

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report
- Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results

## 3. Findings

2.

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>26</sup>)

- **3.1** Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- **3.2** Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
  - Project Finance:
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
  - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

#### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

## Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5. Annexes

4.

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

GEF Terminal Evaluation of the BRA/09/G32 (PIMS # 3600):

"Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region	and included	in the final
Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by UNDP Country Office Name:		
Signature:	-	Date:
UNDP GEF RTA Name:		
Signature:	-	Date:

## 5.2 Agenda & Itinerary

November 28 - Monday

09:30 Meeting with UNDP Country Office: evaluation guidelines. Local: Room Antônio Brand

14:00 Meeting with FUNAI: CGGAM and PMU Local: FUNAI

November 29 - Tuesday

09:30 Meeting with ABC (Brazilian Cooparation Agency): Tânia Jardim Local: 4th floor Agência Brasileira de Cooperação Ed. Via Office SAF/Sul Quadra 2, Lote 2, Bloco B - SAF, DF, 70070-600 (61) 2030-9360

11:00 Meeting with UNDP Country Office Local: Room Antônio Brand

14:00 Meeting with FUNAI: CGGAM and PMU Local: FUNAI

November 30 - Wednesday

09:00 Meeting with regional consultants of the project Local: Room Vinicius de Morais UNDP

December 1 - Thursday

09:00 Meeting with MMA – Rodrigo Medeiros (TBC) MMA – 7th floor 14:00 Meeting with TNC – Eduardo Barnes Local: Brasília SCN Quadra 05 Bloco A Sala 1407 – Torre Sul Edifício Brasília Shopping and Tower – Asa Norte 70.715-900, Brasília - DF (61) 3421-9100

December 2 - Friday

09:00 Meeting with IEB - Marcela Menezes Local: SCLN 210, Bloco C, salas 209-214, Asa Norte

14:00 Meeting with ISPN – Fabio Vaz and João Guilherme Cruz Local: St. de Habitações Coletivas e Geminadas Norte 709 BL E 38 - Asa Norte, Brasília -DF, 70750-515 (via W4, antiga rua das oficinas, ao lado do Restaurante Asa Gaúcha).

December 3 – Saturday

Flight Brasília – Rio de Janeiro By car Rio - Paraty Overnight stay in Paraty

#### December 4 – Sunday

Visit to IL Bracuí in Rio de Janeiro state: Interview with Dafran Macário – Project Regional Consultant; Meeting with Guarany indigenous community and interviews with leaders; Discussion of the Management Plan and visit to environmental restoration projects. Overnight stay in Paraty

#### December 5 – Monday

Return Paraty - Rio de Janeiro - Brasília

#### December 6 – Tuesday

Meetings with Indigenous Organizations and Steering Committee: APOINME, COIAB, APIB, ARPINSUL, ARPINPAN, Coordination of Mato Grosso Local: FUNAI

#### December 7– Wednesday

Meetings with Indigenous Organizations and Steering Committee: APOINME, COIAB, APIB, ARPINSUL, ARPINPAN, Coordination of Mato Grosso Local: FUNAI

#### December 8 – Thursday

Meetings with Indigenous Organizations and Steering Committee: APOINME, COIAB, APIB, ARPINSUL, ARPINPAN, Coordination of Mato Grosso Local: FUNAI

Meeting with PNGATI Managing Committee, with the launch of GATI Project publications at the end of the day.

#### December 9 – Friday

Flight to Campo Grande-MS By car Campo Grande to Miranda

Visit to State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (Aquidauana), interview with professor Paulo Baltazar and his team of indigenous students (ethno-mapping project in IL Taunay-Ipegue supported by GATI)

Overnight stay in Miranda

#### December 10– Saturday

Visit to IL Cachoeirinha (MS), community Mãe Terra (Terena Indians): Book launch "Agricultor Agroflorestal" and distribution; Meeting with Terena indigenous community and interviews with leaders; Visit to three agroforestry initiatives supported by the Project. Interview with Leosmar Antonio – Project Regional Consultant;

December 11 – Sunday

Visit to IL Lalima:

Meeting with indigenous leaders and visit of the water sources restoration small project supported by the project.

Return to Campo Grande

December 12 - Monday

Morning: Return to Brasília

December 12 – 19

Writing the first version of the report

## 5.3 Summary of field visits

All field visits were done in December 2016.

#### December, 4 - Sunday

Visit to IL Bracuí in Rio de Janeiro state. Participants: Robert Miller - Project coordinator Dafran Macário – Project Regional Consultant Dan Pasca – evaluation consultant Guilherme Macedo – evaluation consultant

Meeting with Guarany indigenous community and interviews with leaders about the GATI Project initiatives in the ILs. Visit to the agroforestry sites managed by the community.

#### December, 9 – Friday

Visit to State University of Mato Grosso do Sul (Aquidauana/MS), for an interview with professor Paulo Baltazar and his team of indigenous students, responsible for the small agroforestry community and ethno-mapping project supported by GATI at the IL Taunay-Ipegue (Terena indians).

#### December, 10 – Saturday

Visit to IL Cachoeirinha (MS), community Mãe Terra (Terena Indians), to meet the community and indigenous leaders. Three agroforestry initiatives supported by the GATI were visited and a book about the local GATI activities in forestry restoration was launched and distributed.

Interview with Leosmar Antonio – Project Regional Consultant;

#### December, 11 – Sunday

Visit to IL Lalima to meet indigenous leaders and to learn about the water sources restoration small project supported by GATI.

# 5.4 List of persons interviewed

Name	Institution	Locality
Robert Miller	Project Coordinator / Manager	Brasília
Fernando Vianna	Project Implementing Partner FUNAI - National Coordinator	Brasília
Rosenely Diegues	UNDP Country Office, Programme Officer	Brasília
Tania Jardim	Brazilian Cooperation Agency - ABC	Brasília
Isabél Modercin	Regional Consultant	Brasília
Rosélis Mazurek	Regional Consultant	Brasília
Eduardo Barnes	TNC–NGO partner	Brasília
Juliana Simões	Ministry of Environment – Secretary of Extractivism and Sustainable Rural Development	Brasília
Rodrigo Medeiros	Ministry of Environment	Brasília
Marcela Menezes	IEB – NGO partner	Brasília
Fabio Ribeiro de Almeida, João Guilherme Cruz	ISPN – NGO partner	Brasília
Dafran Macário	Regional Consultant	Paraty
Cacique Domingos Venite, Algemiro Kavaimirí, Cecílio Fernandes, Cláudio Karaí	Indigenous beneficiaries	Bracuí IL / RJ
Lúcio Flores	Regional Consultant	Brasília
Sônia Guajajara, Marcos Sabarú, Francisco Apurinã	Indigenous representatives on the Project Steering Committee	Brasília
Mário Nicácio	PNGATI Management Comittee	Brasília
Jaime Siqueira	First Project Implementing Partner FUNAI - National Coordinator	Brasília
Paulo Baltazar	Coordinator of a Small Grants project	Aquidauana/MS
Eliezer Gregório, Cerize Fialho, Emílson Memédio	Indigenous participants of a Small Grants project	Aquidauana/MS
Leosmar Antonio	Regional Consultant	Cachoeirinha IL / MS
Sebastião Rodrigues, Arildo Cebálio, Inácio Faustino,Alípio Leite, Maria Belizário Cacique Zacarias Rodrigues	Indigenous beneficiaries	Cachoeirinha IL / MS
Neide Salvador, Cacique João da Silva, Juliano de Souza, Jeanice Xavier	Indigenous beneficiaries	Lalima IL / MS

# 5.5 List of documents reviewed

Reading and analysis of documents related to the Project BRA/09/G32:

- Project Document (ProDoc)
- Annual PIRs Project Implementation Reports (2010-2016);
- Annual Operational Plans (AOPs/POAs);
- Mid-Term Review;
- Project Tracking Tools;
- Collection of five publications oriented according to the regions / biomes and presenting each indigenous land experience with the Project;,
- Thematic collection of experiences according to five themes: territorial and environmental management tools; territorial and environmental management training; agroecology, agroforestry and environment recuperation; indigenous protagonism and participation; and project management;
- Financial data including co-funding data and audit reports;
- Minutes of the Final Seminar of the Project;
- Sample of Project Communication Materials;
- "Policy Paper: Gestão Ambiental e Territorial Indígena no Brasil As Contribuições do Projeto GATI";

# 5.6 Evaluation question matrix

# 5.7 Questionnaire used and summary results

The following questionnaire was applied in a flexible way, adapting thematic questions and especially their number to respondents and their role in the Project. All questions were used in the case of implementing institutions and a selection of questions in the case of partner NGOs and indigenous actors involved in on-site execution. In field visits in three indigenous lands, as the group of respondents was quite large (between 15 and 30 people), the questions were limited to the opening questions to start with, leaving indigenous participants free to present their experiences and perceptions. Subsequently, in the visits to plots of indigenous agroforestry experiences, agroecological nurseries and plantations, more specific questions about project implementation and sustainability were addressed.

# Interview opening questions:

a) What were the major challenges of the Project?

b) What worked really well and what went badly?

# Thematic questions

# Theme 1 - Relevance

1- How is the Project related to the main objectives of GEF and UNDP focal areas related to environmental conservation at local, regional and national levels in Brazil?
- 1.1 How does the Project relate to UNDP objectives and priorities?
- 1.2 How does the Project relate to GEF objectives?

1.3 - How does the Project relate to social and environmental development objectives of Brazil?

1.4 -Is the Project related to problems and challenges of its beneficiaries at the local level?

- 1.5 Was the Project able to mobilize relevant partners?
- 1.6 Did beneficiaries and local actors have ownership over the Project?
- 1.7 Is the Project internally consistent in terms of activities and expected outcomes?
- 1.8 Did planning and revisions achieve the expected outcomes?
- 1.9 -Was the Project relevant to other donors?
- 1:10 Did the Project generate significant learning for future Projects with similar objectives?

# Theme 2 - Effectiveness

- 2 Did the Project achieve the expected outcomes?
- 2.1 How were the risks managed? How was risk mitigation carried out?
- 2.2 What specific lessons about the outcomes did the Project generate?

2.3 - What changes in Project design could have been made to improve the achievement of expected outcomes?

2.2 - What lessons about effectiveness were generated?

# **Theme 3 - Efficiency**

3.1 - Was adaptive management required to ensure the most efficient use of resources?

3.2 - Did financial control systems help in the efficiency of execution of Project activities?

3.3 - To what extent were planned costs close to actual costs? Was there anything which was not executed due to lack of funds? Were there left over funds? Did the Project manage to achieve more than planned?

3.4 - To what extent did partnerships increase Project efficiency?

- 3.5 What partnerships can be considered sustainable?
- 3.6 Was there adequate inclusion of local capacity in Project design?

3.7 - Was there good cooperation among the institutions responsible for the Project? (UNDP, FUNAI, MMA, TNC, indigenous organizations, NGOs).

3.8 - What were the lessons learned related to efficiency?

## Theme 4 - Sustainability

- 4.1 What are the prospects for Project sustainability and outcomes?
- a) Considering other projects and possibilities for other funding sources.
- b) Considering Project outcomes, which initiatives were undertaken and which will continue?
- 4.2 Were strategies designed to ensure Project sustainability?

## Theme 5 - Impact

- 5.1 What are the impacts of the Project, considering its expected outcomes, in 8 regions?
- 5.2 What were the indirect impacts?
- 5.3 What was the impact at the national and global levels?
- 5.4 What are the lessons on implementation procedures?
- 5.5 What are the lessons related to the design of similar Projects?
- 5.6 What are the specific lessons about the three outcomes?

## 5.8 UNDP-GEF TE Report Audit Trail

To the comments received on *01/03/2017* from the Terminal Evaluation of "Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems" (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS # 3600)* 

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

		Para No./		TE team
Author	#	comment	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	response and actions
ļ		location		taken
	8		Only one rating needs to be provided for	We used the Rating
			Impact as per p.25 of the UNDP/GEF guide for	Table Template
			Terminal Evaluations, using a 3 point scale:	requested in our TOR
			Significant (S), Minimal (M) and Negligible (N)	and on pp. 29-30 of
	9		Acc. to the UNDP/GEF Guide for Terminal	the UNDP/GEF Guide
			Evaluations, there is no overall Project Rating	for Terminal
			<mark>to be provided.</mark>	Evaluations.
	10		While the Executive Summary is already quite	Done
			long, please make sure you summarize the	
Alexandra			main elements assessed in the evaluation,	
Fischer			including effectiveness, efficiency, relevance,	
			<mark>impact and sustainability. So for example, it</mark>	
			would be important to add a paragraph on	
			project sustainability. Also, for example, while	
			<mark>you mentioned project execution by the</mark>	
			executing partners, please add a summary of	
			UNDP's performance as Implementing	
			Agency.	
			If necessary some of the existing text could be	
			somewhat shortened.	
	28		I don't think it makes sense to present this	The table was moved
			detail here and then to again present the	to item 3.1.1
			Logical Framework from page 30 onward.	(Analysis of
			Perhaps here you could reference the logical	LFA/Results
			framework analysis you included later on and	Framework)
Alexandra Fischer			just comment on the relevant aspects here	
			that relate to the establishment of baseline	
			values for the indicators during the project	
			development stage.	
			If you do take this table out here, please	
			ensure my comments are addressed in the	
			Logical Framework later on	
	50		NOTE THIS SECTION IS NOT MEANT TO	Done
			DISCUSS THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THE	
			DIFFERENT INDICATORS. The discussion in this	
			section of the TE is on the Logical Framework	
			itself, on whether the objectives and	

GEF Terminal Evaluation of the BRA/09/G32 (PIMS # 3600): "Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

	1	1		
			indicators were appropriate, etc.	
	53		Rather than just summarizing the risks that	Done
			were presented, please comment on whether	
			they were appropriate, whether the risk	
			ratings were appropriate, and whether all the	
			main risks were identified at the project	
			design stage.	
	59		Specify whether all three ways were identified	Done.
			<mark>in the ProDoc and whether sufficient</mark>	
			resources were set aside for this. This section	
			is about the design of the replication approach	
			during project design, rather than how	
			effective actual replication was during project	
			implementation.	_
	62		Could also mention 1) Whether UNDP Country	Done.
			Office presence in Brazil represented a benefit	
			or not; 2) whether UNDP CU had established	
			previous relationships with the key	
			Also montion whother UNDR has	
			implemented other GEE funded projects in	
			Brazil or elsewhere in the region related to	
			Indigenous Peoples BD conservation and	
			protected areas	
	74		Please comment on whether all key partners	Done.
			were engaged in the project during project	
			implementation or whether any were missing.	
			Also comment on whether any of the partners	
			were not active.	
	75		Please also comment on how the feedback	Done.
			<mark>from the Mid-Term Review contributed to</mark>	
			adaptive management, including changes that	
			were made to some of the indicators at that	
			point.	
	78		Please include this as a lesson learned in the	Done.
			final section of this report as well.	
	79		All these Tables need to be presented in	All tables were
Alexandra			English please.	translated to English.
Fischer			In this section, please provide a comment on	Done
	83		whether you felt the financial management by	
			implementing agency and by the	
	00		The level of achievement of all the terrets	Corrected Parts of
	69		should be discussed in the section on Droject	the text were moved
			Outcomes and effectiveness here can	to 3 1 1 - Analysis of
			mention the indicator and then analyse the	IFA (about the decign
			appropriateness of each	problems with
			Abi abiliticiless of edem	indicators) and 3 3 1
L				

			-overall results (about the achievements of targets)	
	119	THIS SECTION DID NOT INCLUDE AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE M&E PLAN, WHICH MUST BE INCLUDED AND WHICH WOULD THEN SUBSTANTIATE THE RATING. Above there is an analysis of the design of the M&E Plan and of the adequacy of indicators (and of project results, which should go elsewhere). PLEASE ADD A SECTION ON THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE M&E PLAN ACTIVITIES WERE CARRIED OUT AND WHETHER THEY WERE EFFECTIVE (E.G., INCEPTION WORKSHOP, PIRS, STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS, MID TERM REVIEW, ETC., WHETHER THE M&E PLAN WAS SUFFICIENTLY BUDGETED, ETC. SEE P. 18 OF THE UNDP-GEF GUIDE FOR TERMINAL EVALUATIONS.	Corrected demanded.	as
	120	Please also comment on how well UNDP performed risk management functions, as well as on financial oversight.	Done	
Alexandra Fischer	123	Please comment on whether or not the project contributed to mapping out and determining the relative contribution of different types of ILs to BD conservation Please also comment on what impact the expanded scope to 32 ILs had in terms of achievement of the project's objectives.	Done	
	124	Please present the results by <u>Objective and</u> <u>Outcome</u> and ensure that the discussion is on the level of achievement of the project objective and outcomes, with less focus on achievement of individual activities and outputs.	Done	
	131	For each result mentioned, please highlight the role of the project - e.g., in this case, did the project promote this organic and fair trade or the certification itself?	Done	
Alexandra Fischer	134	This information is a repeat word for word of previously presented information from pages 62-66 (see my comments and edits in those pages). Please present the information only once, by Objective and Outcome. This will make things clearer, less repetitive, and will also help the evaluation report come closer to the 40 page limit that is	Done	

GEF Terminal Evaluation of the BRA/09/G32 (PIMS # 3600): "Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

		recommended.	
	135	Please also comment on whether and how this Project was relevant to the national development agenda and to Brazil's international and regional commitments/ agreements.	Information requested inserted.
	138	However, the Project objective was not officially changed, right? This would have represented a Major Amendment, which would have required GFE approval. I don't believe this occurredPlease make sure this is clear in the text.	Done
	139	Refer in this section to the section in which the extent of achievement of each Project Outcome is described, with description of achievement of main indicators as well. Or better yet put these two sections alongside each other.	Done
	143	In this section on country ownership, please also comment on the level of participation of key stakeholders on the Project Steering Committee, and mention whether the government maintained financial commitment to the Project.	Information requested inserted
Alexandra Fischer	144	In this section on mainstreaming, please also comment on whether the project had any impact on other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, prevention and recovery from natural disasters and women's empowerment. See the TE Guide for UNDP-GEF evaluations for more details (p.21)	Done
	145	This discussion on sustainability could use some more detail. Please see the 2012 Guide for UNDP/GEF Terminal Evaluations for the types of issues that should be discussed here (p.22)	A more detailed discussion of risks were presented.
	146	Each of the four types of risk need to be provided an independent rating. Then an overall rating for sustainability should be provided, which should not be higher than the lowest rated dimension.	A more detailed discussion of risks were presented.
	150	Please substantiate this statement based on data gathered- e.g., from satellite images, etc. Where there are no quantitative data available to show reduced environmental stress and improved ecological status, please explain the process by which global environmental benefits are expected.	The explanations requested were inserted.

GEF Terminal Evaluation of the BRA/09/G32 (PIMS # 3600): "Catalyzing the Contribution of Indigenous lands to the Conservation of Brazil's Forest Ecosystems"

		Refer to the results of the final project	
		tracking tool as well.	
	153	This information does not belong in the	The text was moved
		Impact section, which should focus on impacts	to Project Results
		in terms of improvements in ecological status.	section.
		reductions in stress on ecological systems or	
		progress toward reduced environmental	
		stress and improved ecological status	
		The information presented here can be	
		included in the section on Project Results by	
		Outcome and project effectiveness and in the	
		Conclusions section.	
	158	Only one impact rating should be provided	We used the Rating
	159	No overall project rating should be provided	Table Template
	155	as per the UNDP-GEE Guide for Terminal	requested in our TOR
		Evaluations	and on nn 29-30 of
			the LINDP/GEE Guide
			for Terminal
			Evaluations
	160	The Conclusions should also summarize the	The narts analysis
	100	effectiveness of execution and	requested was
		implementation of the Project, as well as the	incerted at the end of
		strengths and weaknesses of the Project	the section
	169	Any recommendation to recombly the tool	The recommendation
	108	Any recommendation to reapply the tool	me recommendation
		affectiveness on the to compare with the date	was added at the end
Alexandra Fischer		effectiveness on its to compare with the data	of the item.
		that were gathered when the tool was applied	
	474	during the project?	C
	1/1	Couldn't the consultations already begin or be	Suggestion accepted.
		carried out fully during the PPG stage of	
	470	project development?	2
	1/2	Ensure that this is also discussed in the section	Done
	470	of the report on project execution.	- · · · ·
	179	Any other recommendations for future	Text inserted.
		initiatives to build on this project and further	
		strengthen the role of ILs in biodiversity	
		conservation? Any further work to be done to	
		categorize the BD importance of different ILs,	
		to strengthen their management and/or to	
		strengthen their integration into the national	
		system of PAs and ecological corridors?	_
	181	Ensure that this is mentioned in the section on	Done
		project execution/ implementation.	_
Alexandra	182	Ensure that was mentioned in the body of the	Done
Fischer		report.	
	183	Ensure that this is mentioned in the section on	Done
		Project execution.	
	187	Specify which (about the documents analysed)	Done

# 5.9 Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### **Evaluators:**

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form <sup>5</sup>				
Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System				
Name of Consultant: <u>Dan Radu Pasca</u>				
Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):				
I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.				
Signed at Brasilia on November 28, 2016				
Signature: Jon Talco				

<sup>5</sup>www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

#### **Evaluators:**

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

### **Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**<sup>1</sup>

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Guilherme Martins de Macedo\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Brasília on November 28

Signature: Guller IT. in Unb

www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct